

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XIII. No. 20.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 14, 1808.

[PRICE 10s.]

"Were the countries, which have usually supplied us, in a state of independence and security, the prospect would be far from pleasing; but, when we cast an anxious eye to the Baltic, the view becomes dreary indeed. Who can contemplate the consequences of a short crop, a mildew, or a wet harvest without horror?"—MR. ARTHUR YOUNG.
 "If the West Indies could supply us with 300,000 quarters of corn, I, for one, would object to its being brought into this country."—MR. WAKEFIELD.

[737]

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

CORN AGAINST SUGAR.—(Concluded from p. 727).—This subject has been fairly exhausted; but, as I have, in the present Number, a letter from Mr. YOUNG (which did not reach me here, till Saturday last), and also a letter from Mr. WAKEFIELD, the two great advocates for a high price of corn; and, as there are some few passages in those letters, which contain new matter, or matter, at least, in a new shape, I shall notice these; but, as I shall abstain from bringing forward any new argument myself, I shall in this Number close the discussion, lest, by continuing the dispute, we should, for want of novelty in fair argument, fall into sophistry and cavilling.—First, then, with respect to Mr. Young. This gentleman, having in his eye the law of retaliation, employs against me the *argumentum ad hominem*, as the "learned" call it, or, as the unlearned would call it, the *argument against the man*. Referring to page 643 of the present volume, he finds me saying, that, "supposing the measure to be injurious to the barley-grower, I should then inquire, whether the injury to the barley grower would be more or less than the relief to the sugar-grower; the latter being, in my opinion, full as much entitled to the protection of the government as the former." He congratulates me upon this *change*, as he is pleased to call it; is rejoiced to find that I have ceased to cry "perish commerce," and the like. But, pray, Sir, in what does this supposed *change* consist? Did I ever say that any particular set of men were less entitled to the protection of the government than any other set of men? Did I ever say this, or give it to be understood, in any way whatever? I have said, indeed, that the attention of the government ought to be always directed, in a more especial manner, to the internal prosperity of the country; I have reprobated

the running after riches, or supposed riches and resources, out of the country; I have said, that colonies added little or nothing to the strength of the country; but, did I ever recommend the withdrawing of the protection of government from those who are already settled in the colonies? Have I not, on the contrary, frequently endeavoured to turn the public attention to the miserable state of our colonies in the West Indies, and implored the ministers to do something for their relief? This *change*, then, is not to be found in my writings, or my sentiments, and exists only in the imagination of Mr. Young. I am an advocate for domestic improvement; for the doing of that which shall render us independent of commerce, that is to say, independent of foreign nations. I am decidedly of opinion, that, starting from the present moment, we might be so independent as to corn as well as to every thing else. But, I have always admitted, and so has Mr. Spence, that a temporary embarrassment might, and would, arise from transferring three or four hundred thousand pair of hands from the shuttle to the plough; and, though I am satisfied, that we could dispense even with sugar, I never said, that sugar was not a necessary article; but, on the contrary, said that it was, but, that this particular article was always at our command, making a distinction between this sort of commerce and that which can, at any time, be taken from us. At any rate, we have the sugar. The sugar is spoiling for want of being used. Commerce has brought us this sugar; and though I wish all commerce were annihilated, is that any reason why I am to object to this sugar being used, more especially when I am informed that it will cause a saving of corn? Though I wish the Royal Exchange and the Bank and all the rest of it were put an end to, is that any reason why I should not think that the merchant and banker are as much entitled to the pro

[738]

tection of the government as the farmer? Let colonies cease with all my heart. Nay, let sugar go, rather than let all remain as it is; but, let not the sugar, which we have, rot in the king's store-houses, from the fear of its being used producing a fall in the price of corn.—In the page before referred to, I had said: "You assert, that the measure will be injurious, not only to the barley growers, but, *to the nation at large*. Make this out, gentlemen, and I am with you." In answer to this, Mr. Young says, "we have made it out before the committee." To which I might reply, that the committee have, *then*, made a false report to the House; for, as will be seen, from the extract of the Report contained in the last Register, the committee recommended the adoption of the measure; either, therefore, you did not make out your position before the committee, or the committee were too dull to understand you, or they have recommended a measure that they believe will be injurious to the whole nation. I rather choose, however, to reply by a reference to Mr. Young's own evidence, as stated in my last Register. That evidence is before the reader; and to the reader I will leave the decision of the question, whether it was made out before the committee, that the measure proposed would be injurious to the whole nation?—But, while Mr. Young is contending, that the whole nation will be injured, it is odd enough, that he should now, as he did before the committee, take so much pains to separate the barley-growers from all other people. I had said, in page 648, "as connected with a question like this, which embraces the general produce of the soil, and the general interests of the nation, all the distinctions between barley growers are too trifling to be attended to." "This," says Mr. Young, "I utterly deny." And then he goes on in a dissertation of detail about *cropping*; good heavens! as if the nation had any thing to do with cropping. As if, when the question of scarcity or plenty is agitated, the nation had any thing to do with this or that sort of crop. *Human sustenance* is the thing of which we want to secure a provision; corn is the main commodity of this sustenance; and, therefore, it is of *corn* in general, and not of barley in particular, which we must speak, and respecting which we must reason, if we mean to arrive at a just conclusion.—Mr. Young, who was, probably, writing this his defence of his evidence at the very moment when I was, last week, commenting upon that evidence, says that

our contrasting of his arguments in favour of enclosures with his arguments against the use of sugar in the distilleries, "is one of the convenient results of confounding *corn and barley*." Why, Sir, that is your own fault, if it be a fault; for, it was you and those who take the same side with you, who chose to make the question a general one. It was you who chose to represent the measure proposed, as a measure that would tend to augment the evils of "a short crop or a week's mildew;" while some few of you called it a measure for "discouraging the growth of corn;" a measure for "the creating of scarcity;" a measure "to make the farmers bankrupts;" a measure, "a bill," said a writer in the Morning Chronicle, "which should be entitled, a bill to create a scarcity of corn, by discouraging the growth thereof." You were, probably, aware, that, if you confined yourselves to the injury (real or supposed) which the barley-growers would sustain, no very great public interest would be excited; you must, indeed, have clearly perceived, that it would be thought of little consequence, whether the few persons, whose chief profits arise from the growing of barley, suffered a small diminution in the quantity of wine, which they now notoriously drink by the two bottles a day; and, therefore (for the conclusion is too obvious to require qualification), you chose to speak of the measure as one that would have a general effect; as one that would endanger the common prosperity, and even the safety of the nation. After this, after we had thus been compelled by yourselves to combat you upon the general ground of human food, it does seem a little hard that we should be accused of *confounding* corn with barley. But, Sir, as to "the convenient result," with respect to the contrast above mentioned, the state in which your arguments were placed required no new convenience, on the part of your opponents; for, as I have shewn, I think, at the close of my last week's article, it was quite impossible to take those arguments in any way which would not lead them to defeat each other.—You ask me, Sir, if I am willing, that the people should be taxed a million a year to make up for the loss, which the revenue will sustain by the distillation of sugar. No, "without the hesitation of a moment;" for, I would, if I could have my will, lop off expenses, or rather shameful waste of the public money to more than that amount. But, this is not your meaning. Well, then, Sir, I would full as willingly see the people pay a million

in favour
ts against
"is one
confounding
r, that is
t; for, it
same side
question
close to
s a mea-
the evils
mildew;"
measure
corn;" a
rcity;" a
krupts;"
r in the
l be en-
of corn,
thereof."
if you
(real or
rs would
t would
clearly
of little
persons,
growing
tion in
now no-
y; and,
obvious
o speak
have a
danger
safety
ve had
com-
human
at we
n with
venient
above
argu-
conve-
; for,
ose of
possi-
way
each
wil-
ed a
loss,
distil-
hesi-
d, if
s, or
oney
not
ould
llion

in taxes as a million in price of corn, kept up by a restrictive statute; and, you have not heard me say one word in favour of the restrictive part of the proposed measure; for, my opinion is, that there should be no restriction. Let sugar come to the still, loaded with no heavier duty than barley is loaded with, and let them run a fair race. But, if a law exist to prohibit the use of sugar in the distilleries, or if duties are laid amounting to such prohibition; then is the price of corn kept up by statute, and then are the people taxed in their loaf to the amount of whatever money the government raises from corn through the means of keeping sugar from the distilleries. Besides, Sir, taking the question as one of mere revenue. I should suppose, that the sugar, which now lies rotting in the storehouses, has, as yet, paid no duties; and that, of course, the drawing of it forth will cause duties to be paid upon it. At any rate, the committee, who seem not to have lost sight of revenue, and who, as you say, were occupied, with great zeal, solely in discovering *truth*, have given it as their opinion, that the revenue will experience no diminution from the adoption of the measure proposed; so that an objection, upon this ground, cannot fairly be considered as of any great weight.—Mr. Young is quite ready to grant the West India planters *relief* out of the *taxes*. So am not I. I am for suffering no company, or set of men, to come to the purse of the nation, to come and knock at the door of the labourer, and say, contribute towards making up to me the losses I have sustained in my calling, and to support me in that opulence which I have hitherto enjoyed. When the common tradesman fails, though from the effects of war or any national measure, which he could not have averted, he descends to the rank of journeyman, without any one proposing to relieve him out of the taxes. When a farmer is ruined by the rot amongst his sheep; or by the united effects of the kill-calf and the glander, he becomes a labourer, and the taxes remain untouched by him. This is not only the lot of man, but it is right that it should be so; for, otherwise, who would rise early and eat the bread of carefulness, seeing how easy a matter it is to ascribe to misfortune what is the effect of negligence, extravagance, or avariciousness? Nothing but the deepest political corruption, rendered familiar to the minds of a nation, can ever make it listen with patience to a principle so unnatural, so abominable, as that upon which *relief* of this sort is proposed. No. I would rather see the West Indians ten thousand times more impoverished than they are, than see

them buying boroughs, in order to secure votes for the minister of the day, in return for the grants made to them out of the public money. The West Indians have plenty of sugar. All they ask, is, to be suffered to make this into the drinks, which we now make out of corn. And as good a right they have to this (as long as the colonial system exists) as the Norfolk farmer has to sell his barley. We *compel* them, observe to purchase all their wearing apparel, their tools, and their household goods, from us. We *compel* them to bring the produce of their lands to the mother country; and, would she not be a pretty sort of mother, if she were to say to them, your produce, which is to pay for the goods that I have made you buy of me, shall lie here and rot, lest the use of it should lessen the gains of those, who have derived a profit from selling food to the persons employed upon making the goods which you have bought? Commend me to such a mother, if you wish the child to revolt, even at the hazard of its own existence! —Mr. WAKEFIELD's letter contains little more than a re-*etition*, under a new form, of his former arguments, yet there are some few points which ought not to pass unnoticed, particularly as he takes occasion to speak in praise of the opinions of Mr. Young. —He says, that *he* never expressed his sorrow at the foreign supply of corn being cut off. Mr. Young expressed his *alarm* at it, and Mr. Wakefield's letters were calculated to shew the reasonableness of that alarm, by giving us details of the large average importation. In answer to my observation, that we heard no out-cry against the importation of 800,000 quarters of corn annually, he says, that there was an opposition to that importation; that there have been reports and petitions against it; but, *last year*, for instance, how came we to hear nothing against it? The cry has been raised all of a sudden; and that, too, at a moment when the country had, by these very gentlemen, just been alarmed for its *safety*, in case of a short crop. Well, but what was the object of Mr. Wakefield, in giving us an account of our average imports? He says, to induce those who had the power to make such laws or regulations as should insure to the farmer a *better price* for his corn. How? By the way of *premium*, paid out of the taxes? That would have been too absurd. How then? By allowing an *EXPORT*? Good Lord! Whither? To what country, except to the West Indies. But, this, surely, is jesting. In answer, however, to my observation, that if the West Indies could supply us with 300,000 qrs. of corn, in

kind, in place of supplying us with it in the shape of sugar, there would have been no objection to it, he says: "I for one, " would have objected." That's boldly said, at the moment when Mr. Young was terrifying me out of my wits with the anticipation of "a short crop or a week's mildew;" but, it is fairly said, and it is consistent; though Mr. Wakefield will, I am sure, allow, that he has said this from hard necessity and not from choice. I endeavoured to keep up the drooping spirits of my readers by telling them, that the same cause which kept corn from coming into the country would bring hands from those pestiferous prisons, the manufactories, to raise more corn in the country; but, Mr. Young said, no. "We must have a general enclosure bill; for the lands now in cultivation are no more at our disposition than lands in the moon." Why did not Mr. Wakefield fly to my Register at that moment of distress? Why did he not, when some of my correspondents were accusing me of a want of feeling for my fellow-creatures, come boldly forward, and say, that if there were 300,000 quarters of corn in one of our colonies, he would, for one, object to its being imported? Why did he not throw his shield between me and Mr. A. B. (or Alexander Baring) of the Morning Chronicle, who had like to have crushed me with the threat, that we should, in future, get no corn from America? I laughed at the threat, to be sure; but I, though not apt to be daunted by popular opinion, had never the boldness to assert, that, when all the other corn ports in the world were shut against us, I would object to the importation of 300,000 quarters of corn, if I could find it in one of our own colonies. To this, however, I repeat it, Mr. Wakefield has been driven. The importation of 300,000 quarters of corn would, he could not deny, have precisely the same effect upon the farmer here as the importation of sugar to supply the place of that quantity of corn; and, as he had made up his mind to the rejection of the latter, he was compelled to reject the former. Hushed, then, be all your fears, ye scarcity alarmists! For here is a gentleman, who has made the means of national subsistence his study; who has collected together an account of the resources and wants of the country; who was one of the persons selected by the committee of the House of Commons to furnish them with information and opinions; and he tells you in so many words, that, if, at this moment, there were 300,000 quarters of

corn to spare in Jamaica, or Antigua, he would not, if he could have his will, suffer the said corn to be brought into England!—In answer to my question, "what difference would there be between importing 300,000 qrs. of corn from the West Indies and importing sugar to supply the place of that quantity of corn?" Mr. Wakefield says, "there would be this material difference, we could have the corn to eat, and not distill it." Very true; but, this is no answer to me. I did not ask what difference it would be to the nation, but what difference it would be to the farmer; what difference it would make in the corn market; what difference it would make as to the inducement to raise corn, that being the point at issue.—Mr. Wakefield, in pursuance of his laudable resolution to be consistent, and profiting, perhaps, from the cruel embarrassment of Mr. Young, speaks with becoming diffidence of the effect of new enclosures, and even of improvements, though, as the reader has, doubtless, observed, he is as fond of "cropping" as any other member of the agricultural clubs. "According to my idea," says he, "of enclosures and improvements, they will not operate against the chances of the seasons, unless the additional produce of them be exported, or luxuriously consumed at home." Well, then, unless we had added to the distilleries, or set about an exportation, or thrown corn into the rivers, Mr. Young's notion of security from scarcity to arise from new-enclosures was shockingly erroneous. "Who shall decide when these agricultural doctors disagree?" This discussion, if it has no other effect, will, I should think, set at rest the question about a general enclosure bill. I am a decided opponent of new enclosures, until we have more hands to till the land; and, I must confess, that I jumped for joy to find that Mr. Young had given his opinion against the distillation from sugar; because, without hearing his reasons, I was certain that none could be used which would not equally well apply against new-enclosures, supposing such enclosures to add to the quantity of corn now produced in the country.—Mr. Wakefield persists in his notion of a granary to arise out of a surplus produce; and, therefore, let us take a parting view of this same granary.—I had, in my last, put a case of a little nation consuming 1000 quarters of corn annually, growing 1,500 and exporting 500, which, in case of a half crop, would always leave the quantity to be eaten the same. But, I asked, where the labour, and fertility (which, indeed, is only another name for

[744]

[745]

labour) were to come from? I said, that this would, indeed, be to "*set the seasons at defiance; to take a bond of fate.*" "Yes," says Mr. Wakefield, "and that is precisely what I wish to do." But, Sir, do take the pains to think a little further upon this matter; and, then, I am strongly disposed to think, that you will not again assert, that such a theory "*is reducible to practice.*" In the first place, you will allow, I suppose, that, if a nation export half as much corn as it raises, that nation must receive some articles of real value and utility in return. Well, then, if it cease, from whatever cause, to export its corn, there must be a cessation in the receipt of those articles, whence, it is evident, that very great distress must arise; and, observe, that, as this receipt would be *entirely* dependent upon the seasons, there could be very little comfort or solidity in any business supported by such a traffic. Besides, though it does not appear to have occurred to you, that the importation of corn might happen to be stopped by other causes than those of a scarcity at home, yet, you have only to open your eyes to perceive, that, if we had, previous to last year, been a nation exporting half as much as we consumed, we should, at this hour, have been so glutted with corn as to cause much of the land, now in cultivation, to lie fallow. How would you have found out a remedy for this? You must, then, actually have thrown the corn into the sea; for, as to distilling it, there would, from such an operation, have been liquor enough for the people to swim in; and, if you let it rot, it would turn to manure, and that would only add to the evil by producing more corn. This was a case that you do not seem to have foreseen, and yet you might, if you had but looked to America, which, at this moment presents you an example of the practice of that delightful theory, which has, it seems, taken possession of your mind. America fears no scarcity of corn, but she feels a real scarcity of shirts and coats and stockings and blankets and sugar and coffee and of many other things, almost as necessary as corn, even to the support of life. Do you not hear the wailings of the Americans, at the end of a two-month's embargo? What would be their situation at the end of a year? One third part of the produce of the land being annually exported (for that, I should think, was much about the proportion), a stoppage of the export necessarily throws a great number of persons out of employment; and, in such a state of things, this is attended with peculiar disadvantage; for, it is easy for manufacturers or artizans

to turn their hands to agriculture, but it is next to impossible for agriculturists to turn their hands to arts and manufactures. Hence the distress, described in the letter of Mr. Pickering, now felt in America; and hence the commotions, the confiscations, and the pillage, which, if the embargo long continue, will inevitably ensue. And yet, there is plenty of corn, Mr. Wakefield; and yet America has realized to your hand that delightful theory of which you seem so enamoured.—By this time, Sir, I think you must begin to doubt of the facility of "*setting the seasons at defiance; and taking a bond of fate.*" A nation may be so situated as to be able to set the seasons at defiance with respect to *corn*; but, clothing is as necessary to life as food is; and, with respect to *both*, the seasons are not to be set at defiance by any nation that is not the absolute mistress of all other nations. America is sure to have more corn than is necessary for her consumption; and, as this granary arises from a stoppage of export, that stoppage may be made when she pleases, but it may also be made when she does not please; it is dependent upon the will of other nations, as to its duration as well as its commencement, and, it does really appear to me, that this sort of dependence is the most dangerous that can possibly exist, with the sole exception of a total dependence upon an import of corn.—For these reasons I stand by my opinion before expressed, that, the only granary, safely to be relied on, is in the bosom of the earth, and in that intuitive wisdom, which teaches the seller to be tardy in the supply, and the consumer to be sparing in the consumption. As for England, I am no more afraid of her experiencing a scarcity of corn than I am of her experiencing a scarcity of rain. There may be, and will be, occasionally, short crops and high prices; but, the evil is not of long duration, and it only tends to quicken our industry, to teach us frugality, and to remind us of that dependence, which we partake in common with all other living creatures. Far be it from me to hold out the idea, that a distillation from sugar instead of corn will prevent, or at all tend to prevent, a scarcity of corn in England and Scotland. It would be a shame indeed for me to pretend to entertain such a notion, when I know, that, for this kingdom, 300,000 quarters of barley scarcely is enough food for one single meal, out of the 1,095 meals which we eat in a year. It is truly a drop in the bucket: it is, considered as a *preventive of scarcity, nothing*. I have let fall no word, that would lead the reader to suppose, that it was *my* opinion.

that the nation would derive any degree of security against scarcity from the adoption of the proposed measure; but, I know, that to the West Indians, the advantage would be very great, and they have a just claim to a share of the market, to which they are *compelled* to bring their produce; and, on the other hand, in proportion as the measure would be inefficacious as a preventive of scarcity, it would be little injurious to the farmer. All the farmers together supply us with 1,095 meals of victuals in a year, and, surely, they need not be alarmed, that the West Indians are about to be allowed to supply us with one single breakfast, and that, too, only at the rate of about 4d $\frac{1}{2}$ a head! Men talk about *millions* very glibly; but, the longer I live the more firm does my conviction become, that there are few minds, comparatively speaking, capable of fully embracing the idea, else we should not hear them talk of a granary to feed millions of people. Stop the distilleries, what have you? *A breakfast* at 4d $\frac{1}{2}$ a head; and this, supposing the doctrine to be sound, is the mighty resource the distilleries afford us! Three hundred thousand quarters of corn make a huge heap of sacks; but, after all, I repeat, that it is but one breakfast for twelve millions of people. And this is to spread ruin amongst the farmers! This is the cause of all this alarm and petitioning and speech-making and these endless non-describeable fooleries!—Here I put an end to what I have to say upon this subject, which was of the greatest importance as relative to the West India planters, and also as it became connected with the agitation of facts and principles relating to national subsistence. If either or both of the gentlemen, upon whose letters I have been commenting, think it necessary to publish any thing by way of *explanation* of what they have already advanced, I shall gladly insert it; but, as to any thing further, I am sure it will not be expected. I have no desire to have the *last word*; and, unless upon the debate which may take place in parliament, I shall certainly not write, at this time, any thing more upon the subject.—Just as I was about to send off the above, I received a letter from a gentleman in Essex, who expresses his regret and surprize at seeing me take that side of this question which I have taken. “You know,” says he, “full well, how much favour has always been shewn to the *monied* and *commercial* interest, at the expence of that interest, which you have always looked up to as the salvation of the country.”—I am very sorry to differ in opinion from this most respectable person, and I assure

him, that his frankly telling me of what he considers as my errors, or my faults, so far from requiring an apology, merits and receives my thanks. But, in the present case, I really cannot see that I am siding with a monied or commercial interest. The sugar-cane planter is only an agriculturalist of another description; and, I wish not to encourage him at the “*expence*” of any one. All my partialities are on the side of the land-owners and land-tillers of England. If I had thought that their interests were likely to receive injury from the proposed measure, I will not assert, that my mind would have been free from an undue bias; but, after having given to the subject all the attention I am capable of, I am convinced that this will not, and *cannot*, be the case. It sometimes happens, that one is prepossessed by conversation upon a subject. One gets committed upon certain points, either by hasty declaration, or by tacit admission. To this subject my mind came like a sheet of blank paper; for, until I had begun writing my article, which appeared in the Register of the 23rd of April, I had never spoken nor heard a word relating to the propriety or impropriety of the intended bill; and, until I had finished it and sent it to the press, I had spoken with no person except Mr. Wakefield; and it was not likely that I should imbibe from him any impression in favour of the bill. Indeed, until the morning of the day, on which that article was written, I had never even read Mr. Wakefield’s letter against the bill, which letter appeared in print on the Saturday preceding; and, it was not until I saw the article in the Morning Chronicle, that I thought of looking particularly into the letter. That article appeared to me to contain such wild doctrine, that I was tempted to notice it; when I came to look at the debate, in the House of Commons, there appeared to be a necessity for doing it without loss of time. After my article was written, I saw, for the first time, an account of meetings in the counties, to prepare petitions against the proposed bill; and, as it was then too late to make an addition to what I had said, in the Register, I wrote my letter to the Hampshire freeholders, and immediately sent it off for insertion in the Salisbury Journal and in several other newspapers. So little was I in the knowledge of what had passed, that, until after this letter was written, I did not know that Mr. Young had been examined before the committee. Never, therefore, was any man’s conduct more free from undue bias than mine was upon this occasion. I saw what I regarded as a popular delusion likely to prevail, and I did all in my power to

prevent it. The reader will easily suppose, that there must be a few persons, at least, with whom I might have some influence as far as opinion goes; but, to only one person have I written a word upon the matter; to no one have I spoken; and my wish now is, that, if I am in error, the opinions of my opponents may prevail in the approaching discussion and decision; but, then, it is also my wish, that *clamour* may be completely set at defiance.

LOCAL MILITIA.—This is about the twentieth scheme for raising such a force within the kingdom as shall be able to defend it in case of invasion; whether it will succeed better than any of the former time will very soon enable us to judge. As to the number of the men to be raised, that point is not yet fixed, and, perhaps, it will be left to the option of the ministers. The outline of the plan is this: a certain number of men, to be balloted from the militia lists, are to be assembled a certain number of days in every year, in order to be drilled, and to be held in readiness to march in case of invasion. They are to be placed under the command of officers appointed by the king; while assembled, or called out, they are to be made subject to all the provisions of the mutiny act; and, of course, may be *flogged* in pursuance of the judgment of officers appointed by the king. This would be no more than what is done in case of the present militia; but, this new scheme allows of *no substitutes*. All those who are balloted for this militia are either to pay a *fine*, or to *serve in person*; and, every man who pays the fine is obliged to *swear*, that he does not derive the means of so doing from any other source than *that of his own private purse*. The words of the clause are these: "That every person liable to the payment of any fine under this act, for not appearing to be enrolled in the Local Militia, who shall refuse to declare upon oath, that he hath not, directly or indirectly, by any policy, premium, or promise of any premium, or by any engagement insured himself against such fine, or any part thereof; and, that no person or persons, hath, or have, directly, or indirectly, undertaken, or engaged, or promised, in any way, to indemnify him therefrom, or from any part thereof, or to repay to him, or to any person or persons in his behalf, or for his use, benefit, or advantage, the said fine, or any part thereof; shall, in every such case, forfeit the amount of such fine, and be *compelled personally to serve* in the said Local Militia for the full term of—years."—

Upon this bill SIR FRANCIS BURDETT is,

by the newspapers, reported to have spoken as follows: "He said, that there was a time when the army was undisciplined, and the nation savage—when social order was trampled under foot—when liberty was another name for licentiousness; at such a time alone, could a measure like the present be offered to the nation without insult! But now, the moment when civilization was at its *acme*—when England boasted her generosity and her spirit, he could not describe the indignant sensation which he felt at beholding the minister of the day dare to stigmatize the representatives of the people by offering such a measure for their adoption, it required audacity to propose what folly only could imagine efficient, that the reluctant conscripts of our oppressed population should be marshalled under the scourge of tyranny, and presented to the nation as her defence. What! did the noble Lord suppose that the people would endure, or the army bend beneath, the sanguinary, remorseless, and ferocious despotism, which even slaves would turn upon? Did he suppose that the lash of tyranny—the insults, the contumely, and scorn of over-weening power—the "*fœdum signum servitutis*," would be suffered by a free people with impunity! He was far from wishing to indulge in declamation; for he thought, that, at a moment like the present, when our very existence was at stake, all hands and hearts should form a common bulwark round their common treasure, strong from its union, and invincible in its resistance!—(hear, hear.) —But, he added, when you want men for your defence, offer them a post fit for men to enter on; when you propose a military code, let it be fit for Englishmen and freemen. He was not disposed to thank the noble lord for his ingenuity, nor could he consider it creditable, however characteristic. The features of the offspring intuitively bespeak the parent; as with the appearance of the fasces must be associated the idea of the lictor. Atrocious measures must be expected in age from him whose youth had been familiarized to executions; and when the author of this bill had wrung the heart-strings of his own country, little delicacy could be expected from him for the dignified feelings of another. That infatuation, however, was amazing, which disdained to benefit by the lesson of experience; and he thought the fate of such levies as this bill proposed to raise, ought to have acted as a sufficient admonition. We had

“ seen the power of France pass over them
 “ on the continent; we had seen her ruler
 “ by such means, receive the homage of
 “ humiliated Europe, and still we perse-
 “ vered! What folly, what wonderful in-
 “ fatuation! Sir, if we wish for the pre-
 “ servation of our country, let us raise
 “ our physical force in her defence,
 “ let us animate an armed population
 “ in her support, courageous from their
 “ cause, and disciplined by their va-
 “ lour. It is time for us to think of provid-
 “ ing some effectual domestic force against
 “ contingencies. France may not always re-
 “ main inferior to us on the ocean, and the
 “ time may come when Britain must de-
 “ pend, for her safety and liberty, on the
 “ valour, spirit, and discipline of her na-
 “ tives. Does the noble lord suppose that
 “ coercive measures will provide for such an
 “ event? If he does, vain is the supposition;
 “ the salvation of the country depends on the
 “ unanimity of the people, and that unani-
 “ mity can only be produced by con-
 “ ciliation. From that cause alone shall we
 “ be able to date our existence and pros-
 “ perity. But, alas! let me not talk of
 “ our prosperity; every thing I see in this
 “ unhappy land, assures me of her down-
 “ fall; each succeeding year produces a
 “ change of ministry, and each change
 “ of ministry a change of measures!
 “ Thus, plans are proposed, decided on,
 “ and rejected! The indecision of this
 “ government, contrasted by the blind ob-
 “ stinacy of the next, and both outdone by
 “ the nick-named vigour of the following!
 “ Distraction in our councils and impotence
 “ in our ministers, while military executioners
 “ are daring to fix the badge of servitude on
 “ the people! Alas! how deplorably do I
 “ feel at the sight of the journeymen politi-
 “ cians opposite; feeble is the hope of
 “ England, if such is her dependence!—
 “ Sir, such are my sentiments on this bill,
 “ and on our present situation:—they are
 “ the result of observation, and of the in-
 “ struction which I have gleaned from those
 “ pure and venerable authors, which even
 “ the new morality has not taught me to
 “ despise. He concluded by declaring, that
 “ in every stage he should oppose the bill.”

—This report (which I copy from Bell's Weekly Messenger) differs from that, which has been given in the Courier; in which latter paper, it is stated, that Sir Francis said, that he never would consent to a measure, that would make the English people a *flogged* nation. This phrase the hireling editor made the subject of a long and virulent invective against the person, from whom it proceeded.

He says, “ If we are to be called a *flogged* nation, because men are flogged who
 “ violate the military law, we may be called
 “ a *hanged* nation, because men are hanged
 “ who violate the law against treason.” To what shall we ascribe the use of such miser-
 “ able sophistry? To a want of capacity to
 “ discriminate, or to downright baseness of
 “ nature? To one or the other it must be as-
 “ cribed; and let the editor of the Courier
 “ take his choice.—When men commit the
 “ crime of treason, they are *choosers* of their
 “ crime. They are not, by the very nature of
 “ the situation in which they are placed by
 “ *compulsion*, daily and hourly exposed to the
 “ commission of the crime, for which they are
 “ punished. The reverse will be the case
 “ in the Local Militia. Suppose, for in-
 “ stance, a man to be addicted to *drink to*
 “ *excess*. That is a crime punished by flogging
 “ under the mutiny act; to flogging, then,
 “ will the Local Militia man be daily exposed,
 “ if he be addicted to drink; but, this crime
 “ is not his own act, as in the case of treason;
 “ it is made a crime in him by those who have
 “ *compelled* him to become a Local Militia
 “ man. Again: the law of treason operates
 “ generally; it reaches the prince as well as
 “ the labourer; but, the law of flogging
 “ reaches not the officers, reaches not those,
 “ who are to sit in judgment and who are in-
 “ vested with the power of execution.—So
 “ much for the wretched sophistry, by which
 “ a hireling pen has attempted to defend this
 “ measure.—But, it is said, that Sir Francis's
 “ objection would equally well apply to the
 “ present militia and to the troops of the line.
 “ So it would, if his objection were to a scheme,
 “ which would allow of *substitution*. This
 “ scheme allows of none. A fine from a
 “ man's own purse is the only thing that can
 “ (supposing no *false swearing* to take place)
 “ save him from personal service; and, as it
 “ is evident that one half, or, perhaps, four-
 “ fifths, of the men ballotted will be unable to
 “ pay the fine out of their own purse, it follows,
 “ of course, that all these will (unless in the
 “ case excepted) yield *personal service upon*
 “ *compulsion*. Indeed, to obtain this object
 “ is the very essence of the scheme. Now,
 “ in the line, or in the present militia, the
 “ case is different. Into these the men *choose*
 “ to enter; for, though a man may be ballot-
 “ ted into the latter; yet, if he does not choose
 “ to serve in person, there are means of avoid-
 “ ing it, and, if he will not use those means,
 “ he, at any rate, gives the preference to per-
 “ sonal service. But this scheme reduces
 “ about four-fifths of the able men of the
 “ country to a choice between taking a false
 “ oath, and exposing their backs to the lash,

laid on
 scripti
 exem
 Lord
 angry
 denot
 does
 in t
 order
 to be
 of at
 ten y
 he ad
 from
 that
 to pa
 else
 fine
 shal
 with
 of
 Up
 this
 poe
 it i
 on
 ex
 it
 it
 fe
 th
 ra
 of
 fi
 a
 T
 t
 g

[753]

laid on in virtue of the judgment of a description of persons, who are themselves exempted from corporal punishment.— Lord Castlereagh appears to have been very angry indeed, at this measure having been denominated a *conscription*. But, in what does it differ from a conscription, except in the case of the *rich*? Napoleon orders a certain number of young men to be ballotted, and to be made soldiers of at once. Lord Castlereagh orders out ten young men from a parish, suppose, and he admits of a fine by way of *exemption* from personal service; but, he takes care that seven out of the ten *shall not be able to pay the fine themselves, and that nobody else shall pay it for them*. I will take a fine, says he, in lieu of service; but, you shall not have the means of getting the fine, without exposing yourselves to the chance of having your ears cropped off for perjury. Upon the rich, therefore, this measure, this brilliant scheme, is a *tax*; upon the poor it is a *conscription*; and, it is unequal, it is partial, it is unjust; because it prohibits one description of persons from purchasing exemption from personal servitude, which it permits it in another description; and, it throws the pain and the burden of defence upon those who have nothing but their persons to defend.—In its operation it will be attended with all sorts of hardships and vexations. The rich will fine. That will be a trifle; but it will be a most odious way of collecting a revenue. The poor will, to their last shilling, fine too. They will sell their goods, and the goods of many will be sold for one. Where this cannot be done, wages will be anticipated to the utmost penny. Ruinous debts will be contracted. Any thing to avoid a compulsory exposure to the lash. Many, however, *must* render personal service; but, wherever the money can be raised, wherever an indemnity can be provided, Lord Castlereagh may be assured, that the *oath* will have very little weight; and, I am really surprized, that a person, who has had such extensive experience, should have placed much reliance upon a check of this sort.—But, only think of the disgrace, the infamy, which is thus marked upon the front of the nation, by an act to prevent men from insuring themselves against the misfortune of becoming liable to assist in the defence of their country! Against fire, against thunder and lightning, against foundering at sea, against death, we insure; and (oh, everlasting shame!) such is the situation of our country, that it now stands confessed in a bill before the parlia-

ment, and is thus proclaimed to the world, that we, in like manner, insure against the probable misfortune of being called upon to defend our native land! What is the reason of this? Why does the government doubt of the people's readiness to defend the country? It is the people's country, and *what is the reason* that it is necessary to pass a law to *compel* them to defend it? Do they not love the country? And, if so, *why* do they not? It matters not, my lord, you may talk and scheme as long as you please; but, be you assured, that, if the hour of real danger comes, there is no power upon earth that can *make* the people defend that which they do not love; and, if they love the country, they will defend it without any making. Let *all* the people be armed. Give them their neighbours and friends, their natural leaders, to instruct and direct them; make them *feel* that what they have to preserve is worth the hazard of their lives; and, I'll engage that you shall need neither fines nor conscriptions.—Upon the continent of Europe, we have seen government after government fall before the arms of France, and yet there was no want of soldiers. The French were everywhere met by men *forced* into the service. We heard of amazing armies, of immense magazines, of endless trains of artillery; but, in a moment all disappeared. The plunderer came, away fled the defenders, and down came the government. The people of Italy and Austria, Prussia, Holland, and Brunswick were not all *fools* to be sure. They were *able* to beat the French ten times told; and *why* were they not *willing*? Yet, we are still *forcing* the people of England to defend their country. We seem determined not to profit from the experience of the continent of Europe.—I am for arming *the whole* of the people; for, as to any ill use that they may make of their arms, I answer in the words which I once heard used by Mr. Windham, "the business is theirs, and, if they will not defend the country in our way, they must defend it in their own way." Indeed, it is as absurd to pass a *law* to make the people love, as to pass a law to make them defend their country. A law, or a code to induce them to defend it; to organize them for that purpose, may be wise and necessary; but a law to *compel* a whole people, under heavy pains and penalties, not excepting bodily punishment, to defend themselves, is something monstrously unnatural; and to make them, in an hour of real danger, risk their lives in defending others, and not themselves, is impossible.—*Hypocrisy Per-*

sonified, the Lazarus-looking saint, and the big-bagged loan-jobber, may hug themselves at the thought, that the people are to be forced to defend them and their Jewish kin; but, I should hope, that the ministers, amongst whom there are some men of sharp faculties, at least, will perceive, while yet there is time, that there is no reliance to be placed on men dragged to the ranks under the dread of pains and penalties.

N. B. In the last Register, "*mowed with a spade,*" in page 710, should have been "*moved with a spade.*"

Botley, 12th May, 1808.

COBBETT'S Parliamentary History

OF
ENGLAND,

Which, in the compass of Sixteen Volumes, royal octavo, double columns, will contain a full and accurate Report of all the recorded Proceedings, and of all the Speeches, in both Houses of Parliament, from the earliest times to the year 1803, when the publication of "*Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates*" commenced.

VOL. IV. Comprising the Period from the Restoration of Charles II. in 1660, to the Revolution in 1688; and containing an Appendix of scarce and valuable Parliamentary Tracts, written during the said period, will be ready for delivery on or about the 1st day of June next.—The magnitude of the Parliamentary History, the great labour and expence attending it, and the comparatively small number of copies, which, to avoid serious risk, it has been thought advisable to print, render it necessary thus early to adopt precautions calculated to prevent any broken sets remaining on hand at the conclusion of the work. Subscribers are, therefore, particularly requested to send in their names to their respective Booksellers, as not a single copy, will, on any account, be sold, but to the purchasers of the former Volumes. Gentlemen, resident in Ireland, wishing to become subscribers, will please to apply to Mr. Archer, of Dublin.

DEFENCE OF THE COUNTRY.

Enfield, 24th April, 1808.

SIR,—Considering the importance, at this time, of a right system of national defence, I certainly should not have suffered more than a month to have elapsed since the date of my last, ere I had resumed the sub-

ject, had not every moment of my time been either occupied by business, or lost to the purposes of utility by indisposition. In my late enumeration of the population of the states now confederated against us, under the guidance of Buonaparte, I was guilty of an oversight in the omission of Turkey, the addition of whose people, and other minor corrections of the census, on the authority of Pinkerton's geography, will be found to swell the confederacy to full 140 millions of people, capable of furnishing above 23 millions of fighting men; that is to say, soldiers and sailors. That the proportion of the latter, must already be sufficient, with a due admixture of marines and other landmen, (according to the practice of all martial navies) to man a very large fleet, will not be doubted when we take a review of the maritime possessions of our enemies, from the White Sea to the Black Sea inclusive; and when we recollect how many, from one extremity to the other of that immense line of coast, subsist by following the occupations of fishermen; and when we farther advert to the coasting trade of all those petty maritime states, which are usually overlooked when we speak of the naval powers of Europe.—And when, Sir, we likewise turn our attention from the men, who are the soul, to the timber, iron, hemp and tar, which compose the body of a navy; we are to keep in mind what are our own remaining resources, and what are those of our enemy. We know how much has been said and projected about our building ships of war in the East Indies—a blessed dependence! It was also at the time stated, that large quantities of timber had been purchased by England in Dalmatia, and was ready felled, when the events of the war defeated our contract; and it is now understood that Mr. Bentham, well known for his former employment as a shipwright and a general in Russia, as well as for a later patronage of the English admiralty as a mechanician, was lately building ships for us within the dominions of the Emperor Alexander, where of course those ships will now remain to augment the navy of our enemies. Such circumstances do not prove to us that the government of this country has been sufficiently provident respecting a home growth of ship timber; and they certainly add to the apprehension, that we may ere long (if the present confederacy against us shall continue) see our enemy greatly out-number us in ships of war, even to the extent they please; as they are in possession of all the continental forests of Europe (those of now-invaded Sweden alone excepted); and, moreover, are masters of countries abound-

ing with iron, hemp, and tar.—I am not, Sir, one who is afraid of a war with America, if it shall be necessary to the maintenance of our rights, and shall be rightly conducted; but still we are to consider the effect which a war with America must have, if it shall be raging while our country is to be the object of concerted invasions at a variety of points. Such an additional war must create a demand for additional exertions on our part: and must occupy a considerable number of our ships and seamen, and would probably, also, in its consequences, find employment for a material portion of our land force. If the morality of the bulk of the American people, and the good faith of the government be such as you describe them to be, and especially if you be correct in your idea of the peculiar hatred they bear to England, it might not be very surprising if, while they were even at peace with us, they should readily give into the schemes of our arch enemy, so far as to pour into his ports if possible, a great quantity of their shipping, on the eve of a projected invasion of England or Ireland; but should we be at war with America, we could little doubt that he would bend the force of his genius to render the American shipping available to the utmost, to his grand object of effecting our destruction. Considering the natural impossibility of hermetically sealing up all the ports great and small of a vast line of coast, and at all seasons, whether the nights be long or short, light or dark, serene or tempestuous; especially when all this should be a task in addition to the blockading already imposed upon us; it must be evident that an American war, besides drawing aside from their present objects a considerable part of our cruizers, must administer to the enemy's means of invading us, in the proportion in which American ships could get safe into his ports; and we are not to forget, that our blockade of those ports which are the rendezvous of his ships of war, would not close the intermediate and inferior harbours against the merchant shipping of America.—Seeing, then, such prospects before us, and not knowing how soon the line of battle of our navy, independent of contributing to the defence of our island, may have to fight for its own ascendant, or even existence; nor how much the smaller ships may be occupied in all the distant parts of the world; nor what new draughts from our land force may be required for our foreign services in every quarter; ought we not, if we would neither cripple our distant exertions, nor bring ruin on our dependencies, nor hazard the conquest of our country, so to provide for our

national security—if there be a natural possibility of so doing—that we should have nothing to fear, although not a ship nor a regular soldier should be kept at home for our defence? * When I offer it as my opinion, that we have such means, those who have duly and deeply contemplated the martial branch of the English constitution, may have no difficulty in believing the fact; although it must be confessed, that no one in modern times has yet produced a plan in detail, for a complete organization of our *posse comitatus*. Such a plan in detail must necessarily be voluminous; it must include arrangements for having all our youth perfected in arms and tactics before they shall reach eighteen years of age, and with regard to the great mass of the fighting men of the community, its annual classification by age, and other renewals of rolls for preserving a perpetual harmony between nature and military science; as well as a variety of subordinate provisions whereby the ordinary intercourses of society should remain uninterrupted, even within sight of an invading enemy, and all other parts of the country be in perfect tranquillity, must unavoidably contain much matter; but principles once clearly laid down for our government, regulations, in all their parts and sections, divisions and subdivisions, branches and ramifications, would follow in course without producing confusion, disorder, or obscurity; in short, the matter in a well digested system, may, like a column in an army, be of any length, and yet perfectly manageable.—It is now, Sir, nine years since I submitted to the public, in ‘an appeal, civil and military, on the English constitution,’ an outline of such a system, naturally and necessarily growing out of the principles of the *posse comitatus*, as we find it in our common law, and discover it to be an integral part of that constitution, coeval with, and essential to, our liberties; and, although the press, especially of late, has since teemed with plans and projects of defence, I have not seen occasion to depart from a single principle therein laid down; nor have I discovered that I over-rated the *posse comitatus* (equally adaptable to the arms and tactics of any age) when I therein observed “it is “without any rhetorical figure, the cheap

* Not meant to apply to artillerymen; for, although a certain proportion should even be exclusively attached to the *posse comitatus*, they must be regular soldiers, as their education is a work of time. It is not, however, necessary they should be subject to the same articles of war, as those by which the standing army are governed.

“ defence of nations ; while, in extinguish-
 “ ing jealousy, in banishing fear, in assuring
 “ internal tranquillity, and annihilating ex-
 “ ternal danger, it holds a glorious pre-emi-
 “ nence over every other military system of
 “ human invention ” Having thus endea-
 voured to diffuse a knowledge of the right
 principles of defence, and sketched an out-
 line ; and foreseeing as I thought the
 growing dangers of our country, it was my
 hope that some enlightened minister, or some
 able statesman in parliament, would have
 taken upon him the task of giving the picture
 the necessary light and shade ; or, in other
 words, that he would have given the system
 a complete practical form and substance, in
 a statute for “ restoring to full vigour and
 “ energy” the “ disgracefully neglected”
posse comitatus *. Considering that, since
 that time, two other editions of the military
 part of the work have been published, under
 the title of ‘ England’s Ægis, or the Milita-
 ry Energies of the Constitution,’ in which,
 although to the last of those editions large
 additions were made, for illustrating the
 principles, the work still remains a mere
 outline, I shall not be thought chargeable
 with any impatience to obtrude upon the
 public a finished plan, with all the necessary
 details and minutiae for effecting that resto-
 ration. Knowing the system to be founded
 on, or rather a part of, the constitution, I
 could not divest myself of the hope, that, as
 our danger should grow more and more ter-
 rific, some public man of eminence, either
 in or out of place, would sooner or later,
 before our ruin should be irrevocably sealed,
 resort to the energies of that constitution for
 our deliverance. In this hope, the work has
 been very little advertised, but has been sent
 to two entire cabinets of his Majesty’s mi-
 nisters, the last and the present ; besides
 individuals of a prior cabinet, and, last
 summer, it was likewise sent to the general
 officers about the person of the King, to the
 commander in chief, and to his Majesty him-
 self. Whatever, therefore, may be the event,
 from a war of invasion raging in the bowels
 of our country, while the system of the con-
 stitution, explained in the Ægis, shall not
 have been resorted to, no blame would at-
 tach on him who had laboured to recom-
 mend it. But the day may possibly come,
 when those who have pretended to defend us
 on principles that go directly to overthrow
 the constitution, and which principles, if not
 resisted, must as effectually subvert the true

* Sir William Jones. See the Legal
 Mode of Suppressing Riots ; with a Plan
 for National Defence, p. 10.

government of our country, and destroy our
 liberties, as could possibly be done by the
 most successful French invasion. The day,
 I say, may come, when such persons shall
 have to answer for their system ; and their
 own personal defence in that day will not
 gain strength, when it shall appear that, even
 in a military view, their systems are, and must
 necessarily be, glaring weakness, confusion,
 and imbecility, in comparison of that which
 the common law and constitution impera-
 tively enjoin, and which they take upon
 them positively to reject. Accident has pre-
 vented my yet seeing the present bill of Lord
 Castlereagh ; but if the newspapers truly
 describe its contents, it is only an additional
 feature in a system which, to my humble
 understanding, is greatly adding to the rapi-
 dity with which our country seems to be ad-
 vancing to its ruin.—Considering, Sir, the
 supremely awful situation of our state at this
 extraordinary crisis, and considering the
 great variety of systems of defence, and de-
 fensive suggestions, which the patriotism of
 individuals has brought forth, would it have
 disparaged the reputation of that minister,
 would it have lessened our estimation of his
 zeal in the public service, or have made on
 our minds an impression unfavourable to his
 wisdom and virtue, had he, at the very com-
 mencement of the present session of parlia-
 ment, moved for a committee of defence, to
 have examined all that public spirit, or legal
 learning, or military genius, had offered to
 the legislature through the medium of the
 press ; and to have reported on what princi-
 ples, as most constitutional, and most effec-
 tual, a system of national defence ought to be
 founded ? And, had the noble lord, on suc-
 ceeding in his motion, likewise made it his
 public declaration, that, on receiving within
 a certain number of days a letter from the
 author of any work on defence, expressing
 a wish for a particular member of the House
 being added to the committee, he would
 move for the same, I incline to think the
 admiration of such conduct would have been
 universal ; equally preparing the public for
 an approval of the system of defence that
 should have resulted, and for zeal and unani-
 mity in its execution. And when we know
 that gentlemen of talents and learning, mili-
 tia and regular officers of experience, gene-
 rals of reputation, and members of both
 houses of parliament, have contributed their
 quotas of knowledge and system towards our
 defence, it should seem to have been desira-
 ble that all such parties should, in the first
 concoction of a great national plan, have had
 the means of rendering their suggestions as
 available as possible for the public safety.—

[761]

With regard, Sir, to that system which I conceive to be enjoined—imperatively enjoined—by the common law and constitution, and at the same time infinitely the most effectual of any in a military view, I ought perhaps, on reflection, to take blame to myself, for giving nothing more than a display of its principles, a general sketch of its provisions, and a demonstration of its efficacy; how clearly soever it might appear to my own mind, that enough had been said for enabling a statesman thence to furnish a complete plan of defence, in all its details and minutiae of regulation. But as none are so deaf as those who do not choose to hear; nor so difficult to persuade, as those who are determined not to understand; so such persons no doubt are ready to say, ‘There is a wide difference between the most correct theory and useful practice,—between the most perfect abstract and a real substance;’ and they may be equally ready to ask, ‘why, if he could, did he not produce a practical plan complete in all its parts?’—To such a question it might be sufficient to answer, that those charged with our defence did not desire such a plan. But the writer may farther observe, he did not think it incumbent upon him unnecessarily to put either himself or his readers to the expence of that which, how necessary soever in a law, was not necessary in a book recommending such a law.—He now, however, trusts, that a truly constitutional system of defence will at last be shortly proposed in parliament; a system in which nothing will be omitted through party bias, nor any thing perverted from a factious sacrifice of the public good to private ends. The respect which all profess for the constitution will, it is hoped, obtain for such a system a candid examination on the part of the public: and, great soever as the power of a minister may be, yet to a decided public opinion that power must bend.—As a supplement to the observations in my last, relative to Sweden and the Baltic, I beg leave to add what follows:—I hope Sir Samuel Auchmuty has been consulted on the objects of the expedition now said to be proceeding to the Baltic, to aid the King of Sweden, both in the defence of his own dominions, and the conquest of Norway; and that the information respecting one of the causes of failure in the late expedition against Buenos Ayres, which ministers have received, has not been lost upon them. The following extract from the defence of General Whitelocke, is highly instructive. “It had been conceived, that the dissatisfaction which had been excited in South America, by the restrictive jea-

lousy of the Spanish government, had rendered that country ripe for revolt from the parent state. It was never conceived that such a rooted antipathy could exist against us as their deliverers,” [why deliverers?] “as to justify the assertion that we had not, when we arrived in America, one single friend in the whole country; little was it conceived that the whole population were originally hostile to us; still less that they had become hostile from any thing that had occurred in the capture of Buenos Ayres, or while we retained possession of it. The able officer who commanded at Monte Video, had discovered the reverse of this to be true, that they were equally inimical to us and their own government; and on a disorder arising, in which the viceroy was said to have been made prisoner by his own people, Sir Samuel Auchmuty wrote to those who possessed the supreme government in Buenos Ayres, making them an offer of British protection. His letter was answered by General Liniers, the Audiencia, and the Cabildo, all of whom treated his offer with indignation and contempt; and in this sentiment Sir Samuel Auchmuty found the whole population to partake, who had been influenced against the English by every species of exaggeration and falsehood” [together, I fear, with a mixture of truth]. “The natives of the country were indeed disposed to follow the steps of the North Americans, and to erect an independent state. If we could promise them independence, they would instantly revolt against their government; but, though nothing but independence would perfectly satisfy them, they would prefer our government, either to their present anarchy or the Spanish yoke, provided we would promise not to give up the country to Spain at the peace; but, until such a promise was made, we must expect to find them open or secret enemies.”—Now, Sir, are the Swedes, or Danes, or Norwegians more in love with despotic government, more calculated for slaves, than the mongrel Spaniards of South America? And do we not in this mirror see, that if the youthful Gustavus (who I am assured is extremely unpopular with his subjects on account of the despotism introduced into the government by his family, and adhered to by himself) shall have any taste for true glory, or shall know how to render his reign secure and prosperous, and to place his throne on an immoveable basis, he will begin the present campaign with completely restoring to Sweden its ancient liberty, and

Presenting it with a suitable constitution of Government, for giving that liberty permanence to the end of time. By such an act alone, accompanied by an invitation to the Norwegians and Zealanders, to take shelter under his protecting wing, with a *promise never to give them up again at a peace*, he and his ally would, it is reasonable to suppose, be received "*as their deliverers*," and his power be so consolidated, he might thenceforth set at defiance all the efforts of Russia and France to disturb his repose. Sweden, so enlarged by its ruler's wisdom, and so strengthened by its liberty, could no longer have any thing to bear from the greatest mercenary armies which could be sent against it; but if the Swedes are to continue political slaves, and their king an unrelenting despot, neither the gulf of Bosnia, nor all the rivers which run into it, nor all the armies the government can raise and pay, even with English subsidies, can long preserve the Swedish throne, if Napoleon now, (as before observed) at the head of 140 millions of people, capable of furnishing 23 millions of fighting men, have decreed its downfall. And from the complexion of the policy which the ministers of England shall pursue, and the advice they shall offer Gustavus towards the defence of Sweden, we doubtless may draw instructive conclusions, touching the complexion of *their policy*, and the nature of *their system* for the defence of England. —We have seen that had English statesmen acted on English principles, as friends to human liberty, the worst general ever set at the head of an army might, without firing a shot, have severed from the Spanish monarchy, by a single act, the vast province of Buenos Ayres; and little doubt is to be entertained that the example of that vice royalty shaking off its chains would have been soon followed by Peru and Mexico; opening to their deliverers every possible advantage of commercial intercourse, while it must materially weaken the European confederacy against us. As the same moral causes are in our favour in the north as were in the south, it remains to be seen, whether our ruling statesmen have any taste for gaining the hearts of whole nations, by respecting their rights and consulting their inclinations; or prefer the expense, and trouble, and hazard, attendant on violating their rights, insulting their understandings, and exciting their hatred. They ought not to forget the national hatred which subsists between the Swedes and the Danes. By the means proposed this might soon be melted into a mutual affection; but, if fire and sword are to be the only arguments for

gaining Norway, we are not to calculate upon an easy conquest, we may rather expect a counterpart of what happened where the Danes made a descent on Sweden in 1710, while the king was in the hands of the Turks at Bender. The Danes "invaded the province of Scania, took Helsingbourg, ravaged the neighbouring coasts, and extended their levies of contributions a great way into the country." Sweden was so exhausted of regular troops, that only 8000 could be collected. To these were joined 12,000 peasants, the greater part of whom "came in their linen frocks, having at their girdles pistols tied with cords." They set upon the Danes whom they defeated with great slaughter. "Two regiments of these peasants, hastily armed, cut to pieces the king of Denmark's regiment of guards, of whom only ten men were left alive." The Danes fled under the cannon of Helsingbourg, and within five days after the battle had quitted Sweden; * and the reason assigned for this heroism of the Swedish peasantry is, that "these, forming an order in the state, regarded themselves as citizens." The shadow of liberty left Sweden by Charles XII. was totally annihilated by the late king, who, for so doing, was stabbed by Ankerstrom. If Gustavus adheres to his father's principles, he cannot have his people's hearts. If made of the same materials as the other fallen despots of Europe, he has nothing to expect but a similar fate, nor would deserve a better: but if, indeed, he has wisdom and virtue, and deserve an immoveable throne, an enlargement of dominion, and a glorious reign, they are likely to await him.—I remain, Sir, &c.—J. CARTWRIGHT.

CORN AGAINST SUGAR.

SIR,—I shall preface my application for a place in your Register by observing, that it is not my wish to interfere as your auxiliary in your present controversy with Messrs. Young and Wakefield. That controversy cannot be placed in better hands. It is really amusing to observe the condescension with which they notice your inferior progress in the mystery of agriculture, and the confusion of ideas into which they are insensibly wandering, while they forget that a bad practical farmer, if he be a good practical logician, may sometimes prove a very inconvenient antagonist. My intention is solely to combat an assertion lately used (if the reports in the paper be true) by a worthy baronet at a Norfolk county meeting, and

* Voltaire's Hist. of ditto, xii. B. 5.

which he may possibly have picked up in some pamphlet on the West Indian question, or perhaps in the Edinburgh Review of October last, wherein it is very clearly stated, and supported by much dexterity of argument.—“ It appears to us ” (say these reviewers p. 156) “ *perfectly manifest*,—that “ the radical evil is a general glut of produce, “ at least of the great staple, sugar and “ rum, in the whole market of the world ; “ that the West Indian colonies grow *much* “ *more than the whole world can consume*, “ and consequently that the prices must fall, “ and a large proportion of the commodity “ remain unsaleable AT ANY PRICE, until “ the supply shall be contracted.” Again they tell us, p. 163: “ The true remedy for the “ evil is only to be found in *diminishing the* “ *growth of sugar*. Many of the estates “ which produce bad sugars must be given “ up; and many planters will be ruined whose “ property is mortgaged. This will be a “ severe remedy, but it will be a radical “ one.” And again, p. 165, “ Unfortunately “ things are brought to such a state, that “ the sacrifice of many persons is the only “ means of *re-establishing the general wel-* “ *fare*.” Some little degree of indifference to the ruin of the colonists is indeed tempered, in the original, by a string of reflexions on the subject of the slave trade, tending to mitigate any inordinate compassion that we might possibly feel for the few or many persons sacrificed; but the assertion that this sacrifice is necessary is distinctly expressed; and I do as distinctly contend that it is utterly false and absurd.—I apprehend, Sir, that our sugar colonies differ from the *counties* which compose the United Kingdom only in this, that they are more distant from the seat of government; the moral connexions of laws, language, and interests, are the same; their white population being wholly kept up by emigrants from hence, all of whom are stimulated by the hope of returning to their natural home. I further conceive, that the utility of such settlements consists solely in their affording the means of employment to adventurers, whose industry cannot be usefully employed at home, and who are thus enabled to raise either food, or the raw material of manufactures, for the supply of the mother country. This the several colonies have done, and their sugar has contributed, in a much greater degree than is usually supposed, to feed, and thus to increase the population and cultivation of Europe. It is only inasmuch as they have done and continue to do this, that we have any immediate interest in relieving their present distress,

or any motive, exclusive of compassion or curiosity, for inquiring what mode of relief will produce the greatest effect with the least inconvenience to ourselves. That sugar enters, to a large amount, into the food of all, excepting the very lowest classes of our labourers, might be inferred, from the enormous quantities of tea, or of infusions bearing that name, and sweetened with sugar, which have been admitted to the breakfasts of the manufacturing poor; but we have better because more direct evidence. The quantity of sugar retained for home consumption, on an average of the 4 last years, viz. 1804, 5, 6, and 7, was 2,636,658. cwt. Now, Sir, you know that, from the time of the commencement of the American war, or thereabouts, this country, which had formerly exported corn to a large amount, began to import considerable quantities for its own consumption, and that the annual average of foreign corn now required for the supply of this demand is 800,000 quarters. Such is your own statement of our wants, and I believe it to be authentic; and it may be presumed that the weight of this corn, even if it were all wheat, would not exceed 3,200,000 cwt.; allowing 4 cwt. to each quarter, it follows, that our consumption of food in the shape of sugar is equal, in point of mere *weight*, to at least three quarters of our consumption of food in the shape of foreign corn, or to the annual sustenance (if a calculation of the Edinburgh reviewers can be trusted) of about 659,000 persons. Not one particle of this sugar was consumed in distilleries, but was fairly and honestly eaten or swallowed with water by the inhabitants of these kingdoms, and purchased by them at double the price of bread, taking that at 3d. a pound (13d. the quarter loaf) and the sugar at 6d., a price which is below the average cost of that article during the three years. Further, the increasing taste for this species of food is evinced by a comparison of the consumption just noticed with that of the years 1781, 2, 3, 4, and 5, which amounted to no more than 1,422,024 cwt. so that the augmented demand is 1,214,634 cwt. equal to the weight of 303,658 quarters of wheat. You will observe, Mr. Cobbett, that I attribute to sugar no superiority of nutritive power, because its efficacy in the distilleries or breweries is not conclusive on this head, and we can derive no knowledge from comparative experiments; but, in thus comparing corn and sugar, weight for weight, there can be no fallacy; and every pound of sugar must have acted as a substitute for at least a pound of grain, or for a corresponding quantity of meat, or fish, or potatoes,

or other articles used as sustenance; and consequently the colonists must have always been in competition with the farmers who supply the national market with provisions; they must have produced exactly the same effect, and probably would have produced it in the same degree as the foreign importer of corn, had they been placed on an equally advantageous footing. The foreign cultivator, whether neutral or hostile, sends his grain to the British market loaded only with the expense of freight, insurance, and trader's commission, which united charges may perhaps only place him on a level with the British grower; whereas the planter's sugar is further loaded with a duty of 3d. per pound, and consequently, however it may be in request, is rendered too costly for the consumption of a very numerous but needy class of purchasers. I only mention this, here, for the purpose of shewing a fallacy in the argument of the Edinburgh reviewers. Instead of saying that the colonists have increased their produce beyond the demand of the whole world, they ought to say no more than that the sugar grown exceeds the quantity which the consumers are willing or perhaps able to buy, at a given price. But they maintain that it would be *unsaleable at any price*. What? If these self-elected professors of political economy are so pampered that the taste of sugar cannot gratify them, do they really suppose that the oats or barley, or oats or potatoes, which form the sole food of so many millions of our countrymen would not become more nourishing and palatable by the admixture of this article? Would the labouring classes in Scotland refuse to purchase, by *any* portion of their labour, a participation of a species of food which ranks amongst the luxuries of the richest tables? Is it not, in point of fact, consumed by all who can afford to consume it? That the price and not the quantity produced the glut of *our* market (for there was no other,) and that the supply of all the colonies, whether British, French, Dutch, Spanish, &c. was inadequate to the supply of *the world*, was sufficiently proved during the peace of Amiens, during which, exportation entirely removed it. The actual redundancy, which has resulted, partly from the capture of many foreign colonies, partly from our refusal to admit the Americans on the usual footing to our colonial markets, but more especially from the policy of the French government, which has gradually excluded us from all the markets of Europe, is now diminishing and will soon disappear. It will disappear, I trust, before it shall have ruined

quite so many planters as the Edinburgh critics had devoted to destruction, because a *glut of food* is sure to be removed by increased consumption. That consumption has been checked by taxation carried to excess, an excess proved by the total unproductiveness of the duty imposed by Lord Henry Petty, but the temporary sacrifice of the planter's whole profits has again revived it. His distress has been severe, but our advantage has been proportionate to it. I shall, with your permission, Mr. Cobbett, take an early opportunity of reverting to this part of the subject, but in the meantime I contend, that the diminution of culture, which the Scotch reviewers recommend as a *radical remedy*, would only complete the destruction of our colonists, because it is impossible, under the growing wants of our revenue, that they should be permitted to indemnify themselves for their losses by that increase of price which might result from a diminished produce; and that with respect to us, such a measure would be merely a diminution of the national magazine of provisions.—I am, &c. S. H.

CORN AGAINST SUGAR.

(Mr. Arthur Young's 4th Letter.)

SIR,—I did not conceive that any circumstance could so soon have induced me to trespass by another letter on the patience of your readers; but your late paper, in defence of the sugar proposition, renders it somewhat incumbent on me to support, as well as I am able, the evidence I gave in three examinations before the committee of the house of commons; for my opinions there delivered were most erroneous, if yours be just.—Before I enter on the question, permit me to congratulate you on what seems to be the dawn of a change in your political ideas. In various papers, under the motto of "*Pe-rish Commerce*," you appeared to hold the commerce of the kingdom in such contempt, that the Royal Exchange began to shake to its foundations; and you were disposed to represent, with Mr. Spence, internal consumption as the only origin, support, and proof of wealth: the tea of the east, the sugar of the west, the tobacco of the north, were given to the winds; and we were called upon to give up the use of such luxuries. But in this late exertion of your genius such sentiments do not appear; on the contrary, the commerce of the west assumes a far different importance; for you expressly declare,—"*if the injury to the barley growers were proved, I should inquire, whether the injury to the barley growers would be more or less than the relief to the sugar*"

“growers; the latter being, in my opinion, full as much entitled to the protection of government as the former? P. 643.” Here is at least a liberality of sentiment which will please the merchants of the Exchange, much more than it will the freeholders of Hampshire.—In the support of weak positions, there is too often a lust in the exertion of great talents, which on many occasions has done no slight mischief to the cause of truth: hence the arguments of sophistry, in tissues so dexterously intertwined, that though common sense, at the first blush, feels the fallacy, yet to unravel the web of error may demand ingenuity as great as the talent that produced it. Hence the glaring paradoxes that have disgraced the pages of genius: a Rousseau could contend that man should crawl on his hands and not walk erect on his feet; a Monboddo discovers the imperfection of the species in our want of tails; and a Berkley could assure a man, who knocked his head against a post, that he was under the greatest of errors, that matter has no existence, and the post to be found nowhere but in his own brain. A philosopher could deny the possibility of motion; walking across the room was a better reply than a logical discussion. And you, Sir, have had ingenuity enough, not quite to escape this foible. You are far enough removed from such gross attempts as I have quoted, which I presume to mention only to shew that very great men, from feeling a confidence in their powers, are too apt to overlook those difficulties which would preserve inferior minds from such rashness. For not to speak of your agreement with Mr. Spence in some of his extraordinary positions, the paper before me affords a notable instance; for though on the first reading of it I felt that error was at the bottom of the reasoning, yet so ingeniously have you wrapt it in a profusion of arguments, carrying the similitude of truth, that the understanding of the reader, though not convinced, is perplexed with subtleties, upon the very points that ought to be the most luminous and convincing. Political economists and common sense tell us, that if a large portion of a demand be withdrawn from a market, price must fall; that a fall of price discourages production, and that eventual scarcity will be the consequence. These combinations are plain and self-evident; the degree in which they operate will vary with circumstances, and in a case of farming produce, the pressure felt will cer-

tainly be proportioned to the abundance of the crop. Now, Sir, a considerable portion of your paper is employed in stating a train of consequences that militate with these first principles of political economy: they are erroneous, or you are wrong.—For, Sir, what is the grand object of your reasoning? But to prove that an immense demand for barley may be withdrawn from the market, and yet the farmer not suffer; this is the position, turn and twist it as you please. Your imagination is on the stretch to fix absurdities and contradictions on the agriculturists: we may be bad reasoners, but that will not convert paradox into truth.—You seem to think that you have bereft us of our faculties, by the cunning question:—*Is the produce of the distillery, food? or is it not food? If it is not food, the barley is thrown away; if it is food, the West-Indies will give it.* I care not what you make it, while I know it causes a demand in the farmer's market, and that if you stop it you deprive him of that demand. Malt spirits are certainly not food; but 2,264,000 pounds weight of beef, added to the flesh of lean oxen, unquestionably is food, and such food as the West-Indies cannot give; for it is upon evidence, that sugar wash without grains will not fatten. But though malt spirits be not food they are a commodity necessary in the consumption of the people; and I leave to your subtlety to prove, that the manufacture of such a commodity is throwing the raw material away. Such an argument might make some figure in a panegyric on French brandy, but sinks to nothing in a question of British farming. Your argument is to the full as applicable to the brewery as to the distillery. Is beer (relative to the question of scarcity) food, or is it not food? If it is not food, it is barley thrown away; if it is food, the West-Indies will give it; and this supposition touches our case more nearly than at first meets the eye; for your correspondent, X. X., Vol. II. p. 26, whose letter you commend, expressly joins both these modes of consuming sugar as highly desirable to the planter, and not at all detrimental to the nation at large. Bravo, X. X! that is a home thrust, indeed: and I must advise you, Mr. Cobbett, when you address the Hampshire freeholders, to explain this matter fully: illuminate their dark minds, and convince them that the loss of a demand for 300,000 quarters of barley is so trifling a

2 B

business, that your friends meditate the further deprivation of three millions of quarters more. And this without doing them the smallest injury!—Much error has crept into this discussion from speaking generally of *corn*, and not particularly of *barley*, and you have made no small use of this mistake. You say—"As connected with a question like this, which embraces the general produce of the soil and the general interests of the nation, all the distinction between barley-growers and wheat-growers is too trifling to be attended to." P. 643. This I utterly deny; and we have only to compare the two products under a very few circumstances, in order to shew that they must be considered as separate and distinct. Ninety years ago five millions of people consumed more malt than paid excise than nine millions do at present. Has the consumption of wheat been arrested in this manner? Does wheat pay a duty of 34s. 8d. per quarter? The import of wheat is immense, of barley scarcely any. Of all, white corn barley is the most peculiar in demanding a suitable soil. On new improvements, by breaking up waste lands, it is the last grain sown and in many such cases not sown at all. To consider, therefore, wheat and barley without a due distinction between them, would lead to nothing but nonsense and confusion: and has led to such stuff as talking of the substitution of spring-wheat, of oats, and of hemp: all, or either of which crops, may, and would do, to a certain degree, in some instances, but on the true barley soil must be rejected in all. A single contrast will shew the truth of this opinion: superabundance of barley, proportioned to demand, sinks the price: with a similar abundance of wheat, import lessens, but price remains the same. Is not this a distinction sufficient to decide the question? The low prices of wheat which we have seen were caused by a great import; the low prices of barley, by legislative burthens. Hence therefore, Mr. Cobbett, we have a right to claim your support; for you say:—"Make it out that it will be injurious to the culture of corn in general, and I am with you," p. 643. We have made out by a great variety of information before the committee, that the barley growers would be deeply injured, that the clover would suffer, and the wheat also, besides the more general injury resulting in a thousand different ways, from any circumstance tending to impoverish the cultivator of the soil. The reference which has been made to substituted crops, to feeding pigs, to jumbling all sorts of corn together in the inquiry, and

the question whether or not distillation gives food?—all these objects are well enough to play with, after admitting the leading principles which govern the inquiry: but you should first settle the point, whether withdrawing demand does not sink the price. This question should be met, and not shifted to a dependent chain of eventual suppositions: thus, should pork be very dear, give barley to pigs; if the soil suits, sow oats; if rich, sow hemp; if scarcity comes, make bread: but multiply such *ifs* as long as you please, they may all turn out no better than moon-shine. Barley may be abundant, pork cheap, peace with Russia, and hemp a drug. The distillery, Sir, is worth a hundred thousand such *ifs*. The measure is not to extend to Ireland, and yet you tell us we may send our barley in the shape of pork to the West Indies!!! Ireland distilling malt, and England sugar, and which, think you, will send out pork or beef? Such exceptions and exemptions are hostile to every idea of a real union. You leave the Irish barley growers safe, and lay your manacles on those of England.—You triumph greatly upon the imaginary contradiction in those, who having declared the danger of scarcity, now are apprehensive of a superabundance of corn, and as if they feared a glut in the corn market. Our only apprehension of superabundance was eventual scarcity. You cannot reduce the price of any one product so low, that the farmer will not be paid for producing it, without scarcity being the consequence; and yet such a reduction of price will mark what you may call a glut in the market. In this, therefore, we are guilty not of the smallest contradiction, but have been influenced by principles admitted on a thousand other occasions to be sound and just.—You do not approve Mr. Wakefield's most accurate idea, of the distillery being a public magazine of barley, applicable to other uses if wanted. The same idea has often been applied to the export of wheat with the bounty; if having a surplus of any article of produce you do not get rid of it, it re-gorges in the market, sinks the price, and discourages the cultivation; but, as with wheat for exportation and barley for distillation, if either be wanted for bread at home, you stop, what, in such case would be a misapplication, and the command of the grain at once proves the fact, that you have indeed a *granary* to resort to. I think it was Hume, who represented manufactures as a store-house of labour for the public; war formerly threw hands out of employment, and then they were ready for the

ranks of the army. The granary and the store-house rest on the same principle. Yet, Sir, you pronounce Mr. Wakefield's granary idea, as nothing more than buying corn in order to throw it away. Did our ancestors, when, by the first of William and Mary, they prohibited the import of French brandy and established the English distillery (as the preamble of the act declares, for the encouragement of *consumption and tillage*), did they think any thing thrown away that encouraged tillage? Did they not rather prove themselves to be guided by principles extremely different from those which instigated the exertions of your pen in defence of the West Indian project?—The questions asked in the committee, and several of your observations, unite in supporting a notion that there would be no difference between the measure now proposed of withdrawing a demand from the market, and the proposal of the agriculturists to enclose and cultivate waste lands: such new cultivation, it is asserted, would pour fresh corn into the market, and that would have the effect of sinking the price, as much as stopping the distillery. But, Sir, such a position is one of the convenient results of confounding the terms *corn* and *barley*. If such cultivation should, after supplying itself, pour 300,000 quarters of barley, at a short period, into the market, your conclusion would be perfectly just; but it would not of necessity follow, that any such results would be the case.—Wastes situated on a soil peculiarly fitted for barley (like many on the sands of Norfolk and Suffolk) would after some years certainly produce that grain; but the great mass of our wastes are not adapted to it. Oats, rye, wheat, potatoes, turnips, and grass-seeds, are the main articles in such cultivation. Potatoes and wheat to lessen, and, if possible, do away the enormous import of foreign wheat; and oats to diminish, or annihilate, a similar foreign supply. Let any candid man determine, whether our demand for such cultivation, is any contradiction to a wish to preserve to our farmers the markets of the distillers for their barley.—You mention a committee being appointed on the distillery in December, 1806, adding, that you never heard of any report made by that committee. Such a report was made and printed, and you will thank me for presenting you with an extract from it.—“The use of sugar or molasses in the distilleries appears to be impossible, unless that of grain is excluded. To Ireland and Scotland it could not be extended, without a complete revision of all the laws enacted for

“the security of the revenue on the distillation of spirits. By no regulation could the use of sugar be permitted in the distilleries, even to the total prohibition of the use of grain, except to the loss of the revenue of about £115,000 annually, provided the distiller using sugar was enabled to carry on his trade with the same advantages he now possesses from using grain. Upon spirits made from molasses the loss would be still greater, because the duty on molasses wash at present is higher than that upon the wash from sugar; and it would be necessary, as appears from Mr. Jackson's evidence, that both should be reduced to an equal and lower rate. If the wash duty were reduced below its present rate, a bounty would thereby be given on the use of sugar. It is not, however, in the contemplation of the committee to recommend, at the present moment, the exclusion of grain from the distilleries, and the use of sugar mixed with grain exposes the revenue to considerable and inadmissible risk.—For the purpose of inducing the distiller to use sugar at all, it should appear that part, if not the whole of the customs duty on sugar, must be drawn back.”—“The different rates of duty on the articles used in the distilleries, and the different modes of collecting those duties in the three parts of the United Kingdom, constitute, in the present state of things, a difficulty almost insuperable.”—(Report, ordered to be printed February 17th, 1807.)—“I presume it is not intended to extend the use of sugar to Ireland and to Scotland. I see almost insuperable difficulties to the use of sugar in the distilleries in Scotland, and from the little I know of Ireland, I should conceive it very objectionable there.” (Ibid. Examination of Wm. Jackson, Esq.)—May I be permitted to ask, if you, Mr. Cobbett, are prepared to admit the people to be taxed above £100,000 per annum, in order that sugar may be substituted for barley? I add, to the unquestionable injury of our farmers? And I beg you, Sir, to note the difficulties that stared the committee in the face, and produced this report only a year ago. If in so short a period they are made to disappear, I leave to the freeholders of England to judge, whether they have not as much reason to expect that another year will extend the proposition to the brewery, as they could have had last year to see it so soon revived for the distillery, after the report of a committee, who found nothing but difficulties in the execution of the mea-

sure.—I beg, Mr. Cobbett, that you would not conceive I ever meant to say one word against the legislature granting relief to the distresses of the West-Indies; I have no doubt at all of the propriety of such a measure, and mean only to contend, that the relief should come from the nation at large, and not at the expense of any particular class in it: least of all, of the producers of a grain, higher taxed perhaps than any other commodity, equally important, on this globe.—Now, Sir, in answer to all I have said, I know it may be replied, that the measure is a mere experiment, and subject to repeal by an order of council. This refers the matter to the judgment of the administration for the time being, and nothing can be fairer than my asking whether there has, for one moment, existed in the last forty years an administration, who, relative to corn of all sorts, have had any other object than to keep the price as low as possible? The tillage of the kingdom received a fatal blow in 1773. In the ten years preceding that period we exported 2 millions of quarters; in the ten years following we imported 8 millions of quarters; for 20 years following 1773 the price was so low (the result of importation) that the plough was discouraged. Barley, within a few years, was at 18s. and 20s. a quarter, in our eastern counties. I beg to ask, what administration then did for us? And yet it was an act of their own, that so reduced the price. To tell us, therefore, that this measure is an experiment, and that government *may* give relief, is to feed us with a very thin diet indeed: whipt syllabub has cream and sugar in it, and water is an wholesome beverage, but the police of corn in England is framed (to use a farming expression), to starve a lark. What has been, *may* be, is saying too little; what has been uniformly for 40 years *will* be.—There is one passage in your paper with which I am particularly pleased: it is that wherein you liberally and candidly admit, that party has had no share in this discussion. The remark is perfectly true, and it is much to your honour to have made it. Give me leave, Sir, to add, that I could not contemplate the transactions of the committee-room without delight. When and where did the sun ever shine upon a country that exhibited such a spectacle? Planters and merchants, agents and revenue officers, landlords and their plain tenants, nay even dabblers in political economy, all listened to with patience and candour, as if but one motive animated every bosom,—a wish to ascertain the truth. What a spectacle! and whence has it arisen, but from the beneficent providence of a

Deity that has poured out on this happy country the unexhausted blessings of matured freedom. Who that lives in such a kingdom but must draw in gratitude to heaven with the very air he breathes? And thee! bold destroyer of the world's repose, that strivest to sweep from its basis the noblest monument of felicity that human efforts ever reared, thy restless energies, dreadful as they are, will still, unaided by ourselves, be vain.—Let Britons be true to their God, their king, their country, and themselves, and, that unseen, but mighty Hand, which has rendered us the envy of the world, will, with infinite wisdom, protect what infinite goodness bestowed.—I have the honour to be, &c. &c.—ARTHUR YOUNG —*Bradfield-hall, 27th April, 1803.*

CORN AGAINST SUGAR.

(Mr. Wakefield's 5th Letter.)

SIR,——It was not my intention, in my letter of the 14th of March, to state the average import of 1,447,500 quarters of corn to be *only of wheat*, that import consists of various species of grain; and the difference between my amount, and that spoken of in the report of the committee, arises from my account being the import into Great Britain, from which has been subtracted the import from Ireland; leaving the balance of import into the United Kingdom as stated in the report.—It is of little if any consequence to our arguments, as they do not depend upon the details of the import, but upon the single undisputed fact, that this country does import a considerable proportion of its food.—Having corrected this error, I will proceed to notice the observations you have made in the last Register; and in doing so, I shall nearly follow the order you have adopted. And first, Sir, permit me to cite your admission, that “unless we can *in some way or other* add to the quantity of corn produced at home, we must in proportion to the quantity of corn now imported experience additional distress, if a year of scarcity should unhappily arrive.”—The truth of this proposition is indeed undeniable, and between us all argument would be at an end were it not for the “*some way or other*”; and the omission of one word in the next sentence, for I think the way in which this addition is obtained is very important; and, instead of stating without qualification, that we must add to the quantity of corn produced at home, I should say, we must add to the surplus quantity, for if we grow no more than we consume, what are we to do “if a year of scarcity should unhappily arrive”? Suppose we could double our present growth of

provisions, where would be greater security against dearth, if at the same time our *necessary* consumption also doubled? Our necessary consumption we cannot lessen, but at the expense of comfort, of national content, of health; in one word, at the expense and hazard of diminishing the national prosperity. This being the case we should endeavour to create or obtain some new bank to draw upon, and I can discover only three securities against the chances of the seasons; the means of import and export which may be stopped, or a luxurious consumption as to import; the pressure of famine may compel it, but wretched is the policy which leads a country to depend upon such a resource; and ruinous is the necessity which tempts us to make use of it. A large export is of all resources the best, it is a resource always available, and while not wanted enriches the country, and advances the cultivation of the land. At present we have not the power to import, this forms our *present* danger; because, if "a year of scarcity should arrive" we cannot obtain foreign aid; we must now at all events, hazards, and consequences depend upon ourselves, upon our internal means. Now, Sir, what are they? We have no export to stop. What resource then have we? I say we have an available and certain one in a large luxurious consumption; you would waste this before the period of necessity arrives, I would husband it until the last extremity. You say, the distilleries, &c. &c. consume it. I say the existence of the market creates it; take away this market as you recommend from the fear of consumption when produced—and, I say, looking a little further forward than the present hour, you prevent the production of the very resource which we both agree the country will probably stand in need of in a short time. This part of the question is narrowed to this point; does the existence of a market of demand, for any article whatever, act as the means of creating or consuming it? With confidence I answer, it is the means, the only means of creating what you want.—I agree with you in your instance of "a little nation growing a thousand quarters of corn annually, and containing a thousand inhabitants." And I am gratified in discovering, that you at length acknowledge, that for such a nation to raise *half as much again as it consumes*, would be "to set the seasons at defiance," and "to take a bond of fate." It is the very thing for which I am contending. It is the very policy I recommend: you also confess the security and benefit which would follow, but you doubt if it is possible to reduce the theory to prac-

tice; of the excellence of the theory you are as much convinced as I am, you doubt only of its practicability, and your doubts are of two sorts. First. That there would be labour required to produce the surplus corn. Second. That by such production the land would be worn bare. The greatest error into which politicians are apt to fall, is that of considering things positively, rather than relatively. It is common to say "a large population makes a nation powerful." It does no such thing. It is a large disposable population that fills the ranks of an army, and mans the ships of a fleet. If no one produced more of food, clothing, and other articles than his own necessities required him to consume, where would be found that disposable population whose labours augment the national wealth, and by which the state is defended? But the truth is, the labour of one man engaged in the cultivation of the earth, is capable of producing sufficient to support several persons. How then shall those other persons be employed, part of them in manufactures and commerce, part in the public service, and part I should wish to see engaged in raising a surplus of food over and above our *necessary* consumption? But, Sir, when raised what are we to do with it? It is of too perishable a nature to be stored-up, and we have no export for it. Could we store up grain as we do manufactures, we should not need (as it affects existence) either exports or a luxurious consumption, as a security against a year of scarcity. Therefore, instead of that part of the population which is not required to be employed in the production of the necessary food of the people, being all devoted to objects of manufacturing and commercial pursuit, and to national defence, I wish to see a small portion engaged in producing a surplus of food, and which surplus production can *only* be obtained by offering a market for it when produced. Having no export there does not exist any other market than an internal luxurious consumption. Yet, of this the planter is seeking to deprive the farmer, and the nation is called upon to prefer gain to security. But to your second objection, that by such production the land would be worn bare; permit me, Sir, to appeal to the knowledge of old and experienced cultivators for the affirmative of the following position, that no land is so productive as that which is in a constant course of good husbandry. "Rested land;" that is to say, neglected land, is not "land enriched," nor is it "ready for the plough." If by "rested" you do not mean neglected land, then labour must be bestowed upon it. But this will

not be done unless a profit follow, and how can a profit follow unless the land is in a course of cropping? Besides, experience of our present luxurious consumption is conclusive proof, that this theory is practicable; and if it is, you own it will enable us "to set the seasons at defiance," and "to take a bond of fate." The great advantages and security to be derived from raising a surplus production in common years, will be yet further shewn by examining your observation, that "one year of short crop never yet" was greatly distressing; in this kingdom "it cannot from the nature of things be so," and if there are rested fields always ready "for the plough, there can be only one year" of short crop at a time." This observation may well be considered in two ways. First, by admitting its truth for the purpose of the argument; and then, by shewing wherein its fallacy consists. Now, Sir, admitting your observation to be true, what is the consequence? Why, that according to your argument we are to bear the distress (such as it is) of a year of scarcity in the first instance, and hope for plenty in a subsequently more extended agriculture. But, according to mine, the relief is at hand; we have not to wait a day at any time, the distilleries may be prohibited the use of grain, and thus instantaneous relief may be obtained. Anticipate this resource now, prohibit the use of grain in the distilleries, and so either reduce production, or augment necessary consumption to the amount of grain so used, and the result is, the resource *when wanted*, will have been *anticipated*, it will have been *wasted*, and in the moment of necessity we shall seek for it in vain, and curse the cupidity which has mislead us to exhaust for the sake of profit, a resource which should have been husbanded for the sake of subsistence. But independent of this argument, founded upon an admission of the truth of your observation, I deny its truth, for "one year of short crop" is not only distressing, but amounts almost to famine to a large portion of the community. The bad harvest of 1799 produced a scarcity in 1800, in 1798, and 1799: the price of wheat had averaged at 58s. 10d. the quarter; but in 1800 the price averaged at 113s. 7d. the quarter. I am aware that to the *whole* community the deficiency of the crop was not felt in any proportion to the advance of price, but amongst the lower classes it was so felt. Though the advance of price only deprived the middle and higher orders of some comforts and more luxuries, it deprived the lower of many meals; the lower classes felt their necessary consumption unprovided

for in nearly the same proportion as the difference of price; the next year another short crop occurred, and the price advanced to 118s. 3d. the quarter, and then the distress mounted higher, not so much from the increase of 4s. 8d. the quarter, as from the previous impoverishment of the lowest of the middle class. I think, then, that it follows from this reference to *fact*, that one year of short crop does produce great distress. I have not, however, done with this observation, for I have another objection to make. I have already denied (and that from knowledge gained by personal experience) that "rested fields" are always, or indeed, *ever* ready for the plough; and, I say more that out of the regular course of cropping no land can be properly said to be "ready for the plough." The true question between us is, however, this. Ought or ought not a nation to grow annually more than its necessary consumption? Both you and myself think it ought so to do, and even the friends of a provision import, will in the present state of things agree that this ought to be done. Now, how can this surplus production be obtained? I contend that it can only be obtained by finding a market for it when produced; and, unless an export, or to use other words, a foreign market can be found, there cannot in the nature of things be any other demand offered to the grower than that of a large internal luxurious consumption. Now we have no other luxurious consumption than the distilleries and the breweries, over which an instantaneous command can be held. If your argument is good for any thing, it is good to the extent of prohibiting the use of malt in the *brewery* of beer. But the glaring impolicy, (glaring in its extent—the principle is the same whether distillery or brewery) of this application of the same principle to the breweries, which is proposed to be applied to the distilleries, has deterred the planter from seeking to oust the farmer from this part of his market, and so to deprive the country of this part of its resource against the season of scarcity and distress. But, inasmuch as beer is more necessary, and less a luxury than spirits, in the same proportion it is right to husband the resource of the distillery, that in the period of dearth the greater luxury may be sacrificed before the lesser one is made to give way to the pressure of distress.—No part of the subject more pointedly shews the fallacy of the principle than this, carry your principle on—*confine* the farmer to *only* use his barley for the food of hogs. And need I ask, if his interest will not point out to him, not to create, not to produce that which he cannot

sell?—Far from expressing sorrow that the supply of foreign grain is cut off by the enemy, I have throughout my correspondence with you, lamented and reprobated the shallow, weak, and ruinous policy, which has led the country to prefer import to export; to encourage the first rather than the last, to depend upon foreign aid instead of internal resource. You, indeed, speak with confidence of the silence of the landed interest during the last thirty years, in which import has taken place and increased. But, surely, Sir, you have forgotten the opposition to the act of 1791, and the county meetings, the county petitions, and the corn committee of 1804; and that parliament was detained in order to pass a law pursuant to the recommendation of that committee. Was this no alarm? No opposition? Surely this was neither silence nor acquiescence. No, Sir; every one acquainted with the principles which generate and guide public prosperity, foresaw the dangerous consequences in this change of our agricultural policy. Many years back, Colonel Dirom was roused by the prospect of the dangers to which the country was exposed by it, to undertake his admirable "Essay on the Corn Laws." And above thirty years since, Mr. Young, to whose well-earned and extended fame, my praise cannot add, raised a warning voice against it; and ere long, sad and suffering experience will prove the truth of their predictions.—With regard to my remarks relative to the loss of the distillers, I must beg you will recollect, that I urged it under the twofold view of injustice to him, and loss to the revenue. Has he not been encouraged to invest his capital in his plant, in consequence of the legislatures having imposed duties amounting to a prohibition of distilling from sugar and molasses? The encouragement on the faith of which the distiller acted, was no "secret," it was never "whispered" amongst the trade, it was an open, avowed, public, and long standing agreement between the distiller and the government; and so I observe, that the sugar committee consider it, for they recommend the distilling from sugar should be confined to the present malt distilleries; that is to say, to those who on the faith of parliament have invested their property in a plant, adapted to the malt distillery. Far then from the distiller "whispering his fears to his partner," if this destructive measure is pursued, he will have a fair and well-grounded right to apply to parliament, to either make good to him the loss of his plant, or to follow the recommendation of the committee.—As to the revenue, I still retain my former opinion, which in-

deed, you do not endeavour to impugn, for your remarks are against all taxation, instead of tending to shew that the revenue will not suffer. And, indeed, your "Hampshire correspondent" shews an additional loss in this respect, for he says, as much spirit may be obtained from 1,435,000 cwt. of sugar, as from 900,000 quarters of grain or malt; and that this quantity of sugar costs £2,000,000 and pays £2,500,000 to the revenue. Now the present price of barley is under 50s. the quarter, which is only £2,250,000, so that the whole of the duty upon sugar must be drawn back, to which must also be added the loss of the duty upon the malt consumed in the distilleries.—But, Sir, you ask me, "what is the difference between an import in the shape of sugar, and one in the shape of corn?" and then say, that "if it was proposed to import 300,000 qrs of corn from the colonies, it would not be objected to." For one I should certainly object, and that, because I consider *all* import of provisions to be bad policy, injurious to the farmer, and dangerous to the safety of the country. There is, however, an *essential difference* between an import of sugar and one of corn. If the West Indies could supply us with 300,000 qrs. of corn, and such import were consumed in the distilleries, or any other surplus consumption, *then* when the season of scarcity arrived, it would be an available resource, for we could stop the distillery and eat the corn; but by stopping the distilleries we cannot convert sugar into food. Besides, Sir, suffer me to advert to the idea upon which you so much dwell, that corn used in the distilleries must be considered for all the purposes of the present argument, as corn "thrown into the sea." Pray what is this sugar to be? If a luxurious consumption of corn, is "corn thrown away," is not a similar consumption of sugar thrown away; the one thrown away to encourage the British farmer, and insure the nation against the chances of the season; the other to profit the planter? So that, if there is any "absurdity" in my idea of so consuming a portion of the farmer's produce, there is the same absurdity in your pleading for a similar consumption of the planters, with this difference however, that the utmost good to the planter is to save him a money loss, that the benefit to the country by my proposal is extending agricultural and national security.—I purposely put off the discussion of the policy of inclosures and improvement, which have in many respects, though not in all, the same consequences; because, as I stated in my former letter, I considered them "rather to be the effect of prosperity, than its

positive parent." In your view of the subject, you only regard the increase of quantity operating upon price; now, you should likewise consider, that the farmer's profit is regulated by two other circumstances besides that of price; by his expenses, and by the quantity of his produce. If, then, the expenses of the cultivator do not increase in the same proportion as the quantity of produce, he will still derive benefit, although the price should fall in proportion to the augmentation of that produce. But, Sir, according to my idea of inclosures and improvements, they will not operate as a security against the chances of the seasons, unless the additional produce of them be either exported, or luxuriously consumed in common years. They are a great and extensive gain to a nation in other ways, they are equivalent to an extension of territory, and they increase the number of the people; and these internal colonies, if I may be allowed the expression, require no additional care or expense in their defence, while they open a new, profitable, and increasing market to the produce and manufactures of every part of the empire; for, if all the waste lands were cultivated and peopled, our consumption of other things would be proportionably increased. Thus, Sir, it appears to me that an import of corn is an uncertain and ruinous resource, that in the present state of things we cannot even expect momentary relief from it, and that in order to secure the nation against the chances of the seasons, we ought to annually produce more than our necessary consumption; that to obtain this surplus produce a market must be found, and that such market can *only* be found in either an export or a luxurious consumption. Give to the farmer an export, and I, for one, readily consent to give the planter the market of luxurious consumption; but, until the joyous and prosperous times of a corn export shall arrive, our internal market of luxurious consumption should be secured to the cultivator, and every exertion called forth in order to increase and extend this market, instead of permitting it to be encroached upon by any description of persons whatever.

I am, Sir, &c.—EDWARD WAKEFIELD.—
Duke Street, Westminster, May 6, 1808.

CORN AGAINST SUGAR.

SIR,—When a genius and experience like yours, adopts, with no inconsiderable pertinacity, any particular tenet, it becomes the novice to pause before he ventures an opposition. To say, therefore, that the proposed measure of government for prohibiting the use of corn in distilleries will

be pernicious, is not my intention; my wish at present is, that previous to the entering into any detail respecting the quantity of corn and sugar on hand, or the relative loss which the suspension of the use of either in any way will contribute to the proprietor, the principle upon which sugar is to be consumed, and corn to be prohibited, or the converse, should be clearly comprehended. I confess, Sir, that if this has already been done, I must apologise for my dullness in not having discovered it; and yet that you should have immersed into the confusion of particulars before you had established principles, is so dissonant to your habits on all former occasions, that I can scarcely persuade myself that you have departed from so wholesome a plan in discussing the present important topic. Perhaps you will excuse me, Mr. Cobbett, if I venture to state my sentiments in regard to principles, in deference to which, all argument I should insist, must be founded. In the first place, Sir, I presume it to be an established axiom, that all articles of manufacture, or merchandize do, of themselves, find a level in respect of their value; and that any artificial interposition, whether legislative or otherwise, is generally, if not always, more injurious than beneficial. The manufacturer of hardware will not remain in the continued occupation of his trade, if he finds that the profits upon the article he vends produce a bare subsistence, while those arising from farming, support a luxurious table; and I conjecture that whenever from accident that should be the case, the number of manufacturers would diminish, whilst the farmers would experience a proportionate increase, until their respective articles of merchandise should produce an equal advantage in the sale. The consequence of this axiom is, I am disposed to believe, this: that all articles of merchandise, whether of corn or metals, will be sold at such a profit as may be considered fair and reasonable. That in average years of sale this must be so, there can be little doubt. Now these axioms are so clear, that there requires no ghost to impart the discovery, and I should probably have passed over these preliminary data, but for the expressions which have escaped your pen, and which have rather astonished me; I mean that passage of your address where you deride the idea that may be entertained, lest corn should be sold too *cheap*. Now if "*cheap*" has any solid meaning attached to it, it must be a relative one, and must of necessity imply, that corn either is at present, or has been heretofore, sold at a profit which ought not to have

been made; that in fact, the farmer's has been a more lucrative trade than any other: that this, however, cannot be from the data I have before laid down, is quite clear, and were I addressing myself to any one but a man whose principles, independence, and repeated integrity have uniformly claimed my admiration, and I am persuaded will always justify my esteem, I should be disposed to say, that he had made an attempt to prop a weak and falling system by an unmanly appeal to the prejudices of the weak and inconsiderate many. From what I have already noticed, it must be of necessity deduced, that all tradesmen and manufacturers will obtain for the commodities they vend a fair profit, and that this profit will not be greater with one class than another, but as nearly as can be on an average, the same. To produce, however, this equality of profit, it is apparent that no tradesman or manufacturer will ever possess a greater quantity of the merchandise in which he deals, than he finds to be vendible, because otherwise his profits would be reduced by a stagnant capital, from which no advantage would be derived. Now it appears to me, that the interests of society do not require that any merchant should keep by him any quantity of merchandise beyond the ordinary demand, *except* with respect to the article of CORN; and here an exception arises which is clear, palpable, and rational to the understanding. Almost all other articles of merchandise depend, in respect of their plenitude, upon human industry; but the supply of corn depends in a great measure upon the temperature of seasons; and it, passeth the foresight and understanding of the most skilful, to prevent the ravage and destruction of an unpropitious summer. But in almost all other species of merchandise, the scarcity may be either dispensed with, or accommodated by a succedaneum; but not so with corn; human existence depends upon the abundance of the supply of this esculent, and for any continuation of time, no discovery of man can anticipate or prevent the calamities of an insufficiency. It is quite manifest and unquestionable therefore, that there should be always on hand a considerable greater quantity of corn than can be consumed by the ordinary demand for food; but by whom is this quantity to be raised? By whom kept to alleviate, or rather preclude the miseries of squalid famine? Are we to look for it in the granaries of our patriots? Will the farmers hoard it? Does each individual, with a cautious prudence, like the ant, accumulate it for a

season of scarcity? How then is this superabundance to be preserved?—The means have been discovered—the superabundance* finds a market in the distilleries—what is the beneficial consequence resulting from this?—Why the season of scarcity arrives; the use of the distilleries is suspended, and the proportion of corn intended for *that* market, is turned into the current, that with a well-timed supply, will support the hero and the less-valiant, the philosopher and the tyro; and the impending gloom is dispelled by the invigorating rays of a genial sun. When the reverse of the picture is considered, and we behold desponding and hopeless countenances; when we see the purple hue of youth precipitated into the sombre mask of wrinkled age, the flushed glow of humanity may be excused, if it betrays any considerable jealousy at any purposed political regulation, which may prematurely occasion the reality of the misfortune, from which we shrink with horror, even in a visionary contemplation. I find I have been guilty of a digression; but I will now resume the subject, which is nearly concluded. If it be necessary that this superfluity of corn should exist, and if it cannot exist without a market, which in years of plenty will take it off the hands of the farmer, where is that market to be found, if the use of distilleries should be suspended?—The prohibiting the consumption of the still will, I admit, produce the consequence which you seem, Sir, to approve, namely, *cheapness* in the price; but in *intelligible* language, this word "*cheapness*" must be construed, injury to the farmer; because if the present price only yields a fair profit in relation to other vendible commodities, a less price, or cheapness, must be a reduction below a fair profit, and the consequence will be, upon the data before laid down, that the farmer will exchange the superabundant production of corn for the growth or manufacture of a commodity that will yield in its sale an increased profit. These are the principles, Sir, that I was anxious to have clearly understood; and if you feel that they are founded in candour and truth, I am persuaded you will adopt them in the investigation of the momentous question, whether it be wise and prudent to prohibit the distillation from corn, and adopt the use of sugar?—I am, &c.—W. D. S.—*Lincoln's Inn, Monday, May 2, 1808.*

* By superabundance I uniformly mean the surplus after satisfying the demand for food.

WOODCOCKS AND SNIPES.

SIR;—As the sentiments which are delivered by you upon political subjects have always great weight, and in general deservedly so with the public, I am anxious to remove the ill impressions which the communications on woodcocks and snipes, which was inserted by you, has very likely produced. —Notwithstanding you and one of your correspondents have treated this matter slightly, I conceive that it is entitled to serious consideration. I object to making woodcocks and snipes game, for all the reasons which may be adduced against the game laws; but as their injustice is not called in question at present, it would be irrelevant to state those reasons. —I think that it will not be denied, that animals of every description, as well those which are denominated game as the others, were given to all mankind; and, therefore, to restrict in any manner whatever, when the common good does not require it, a person from doing with them what he chuses, is an unjust violation of his natural rights: then, does the public welfare require that a large majority of mankind should be excluded from killing woodcocks and snipes, by making those animals game? —The only reason which has been urged by the advocates of the game laws in their favour, which appears to me to deserve much attention, does not apply to woodcocks and snipes. That reason is, that those animals, which are now included in the game laws, would very soon be all destroyed, if every person were permitted to kill them at his pleasure. Without combating this argument, but which I think I could do with success, it will be sufficient for my purpose to state, that no such apprehensions need be entertained on account of woodcocks and snipes, since a fresh supply of them arrives every year, and if they are not *destroyed*, they will all *go away* early in the spring. —It has been stated by you, that you do not know any right which will be abridged by the making of woodcocks and snipes game, as far as relates to any amusement of the people; from which observation I infer that your opinion is, that the people have no right at present so to amuse themselves. Now, although it cannot be denied that to go upon the land of another person, upon any pretence whatever, without the leave of the owner, is contrary to law, and subjects the offender to an action of trespass, yet it never was intended that the law should be enforced in such cases as going upon the land for the purpose of killing woodcocks and snipes, where no substantial injury is com-

mitted; and the law, to guard against such vexatious proceedings, whenever damages for trespass are awarded by a jury to a less amount than 40s., makes the plaintiff pay his own costs of suit, unless notice has been given to the defendant not to come upon the land. Besides, consent is always *virtually* given in such cases, and I should not expect to have an action brought against me merely for shooting woodcocks and snipes, sooner than for cutting a twig from a hedge, or taking up a stone which lay under my foot in a path. But who would scruple to do those acts, or think that he acted wrong in doing them, although, in *strictness of law*, he committed a trespass? When there is an intention to do an injury upon the land, it is a wrongful act; when there is no such intention, it is not so. Birds of every description, which are not what the law terms reclaimed, that is, made tame, or secured from escaping, are the property of the public, and the public have, properly speaking, a right to look for them upon the private land of any individual, if by so doing, they do not commit any real injury on it, although, in *strictness of law*, a trespass may be committed. If a stranger left open a gate between a field of yours, in which there was a flock of sheep grazing, and a field of your neighbour's, in which there was a crop of turnips intended for seed, in consequence whereof the sheep entered the turnip field, and were doing great damage, and you passed by and saw them in the act, should you scruple to go in and drive them out, although you in *strictness of law*, did commit a trespass by so doing? This shews that it not only is not always wrong, but that it is *meritorious* in some cases to commit trespasses. —You appear to think, that the owner of land has a right to go upon it in pursuit of game when there is a tenant in possession of it without trespassing; but I apprehend that this is not the case, unless a *reservation* is made of the right. —You also state, that unqualified persons are already prevented from shooting woodcocks and snipes, with the consent of the person in possession of the land, as completely as this dreaded law can make them; if this is so, the law must be passed merely from wantonness, and on that account ought to be rejected; for laws wantonly passed, are certainly tyrannical and unjust; it is shewing the rod unnecessarily. But I do not think that this proposed law will not form an additional obstacle to the shooting of woodcocks and snipes, by unqualified persons. Your reasoning is this: "to go a shooting woodcocks and snipes without a spaniel, or dog of some sort, is

what no body thinks of;" (yet I myself have many times done it) "to be seen out with dog and gun, the law takes as proof of being in pursuit of game; being in pursuit of game, subjects the unqualified pursuer to the penalty of five pounds," &c. &c. Now, I always understood, that whether the defendant was in pursuit of game or not, was a fact to be collected, in all cases, by the evidence produced; for I do not know of any act of parliament which presumes, that a person being out with a dog and gun, without any other evidence being adduced, is in pursuit of game, and subjects him to the penalty. Then, what jury, or what justice of the peace, would say that a person was in pursuit of game, who was found sporting with a dog and gun in places where woodcocks and snipes, particularly the latter, are generally found, those places not being the resorts of game? I also object to the contemplated act, because the people will be thereby deprived of the practical knowledge of the use of fire-arms. If, as it ought to be, the government of this country is founded on the affections of the people, the motives for the use of fire-arms by them should be as numerous as possible; then every peasant would be a soldier trained to arms, prepared to defend his country in the hour of necessity. But, it has been the policy of this country, an odious policy, which had its foundation in tyranny (and to which Blackstone thinks the game laws owe their origin and chief support), to prevent the people from being acquainted with the use of fire-arms. I hope that this measure has not that object in view. For these reasons I think, that the proposed act to include woodcocks and snipes in the game laws, if passed, will unnecessarily deprive the people of one of their most manly, healthful, and rational amusements, and unnecessarily take away one of their few remaining natural rights. But I hope that the ministers of this country have profited better by the dreadful example which has been afforded them, by those tyrannical governments of Europe, who have brought destruction upon themselves by their unjust violation of the rights of the people.—R. R.—30th April, 1808.

A LETTER FROM THE HON. TIMOTHY PICKERING, A SENATOR OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, AND SECRETARY OF STATE UNDER GEN. WASHINGTON, EXHIBITING TO HIS CONSTITUENTS A VIEW OF THE IMMINENT DANGER OF AN UNNECESSARY AND RUINOUS WAR WITH GREAT BRITAIN:

ADDRESSED TO HIS EXCELLENCY JAMES SULLIVAN, GOVERNOR OF THE SAID STATE.—*Dated City of Washington, Feb. 16, 1808.*

(*Concluded from page 736.*)

I trust, Sir, any one who knows me, will charge it to vanity when I say, that I have some knowledge of public men and of public affairs: and on that knowledge, and with solemnity, I declare to you, that I have no confidence in the wisdom or correctness of our public measures: that our country is in imminent danger: that it is essential to the public safety that the blind confidence in our rulers should cease: that the state legislatures should know the facts and reasons on which important general laws are founded; and especially that those states whose farms are on the ocean, and whose harvests are gathered in every sea, should immediately and seriously consider how to preserve them. In all the branches of government, commercial information is wanting; and in "this desert," called a city, that want cannot be supplied. Nothing but the sense of the commercial states, clearly and emphatically expressed, will save them from ruin.—Are our thousands of ships and vessels to rot in our harbours? Are our 60,000 seamen and fishermen to be deprived of employment, and, with their families, reduced to want and beggary? Are our hundreds of thousands of farmers to be compelled to suffer their millions in surplus produce to perish on their hands; that the president may make an experiment on our patience and fortitude, and on the towering pride, the boundless ambition and unyielding perseverance of the conqueror of Europe? Sir, I have reason to believe that the president contemplates the continuance of the embargo, until the French Emperor repeals his decrees violating as well his treaty with the U. States, as every neutral right; and until Britain thereupon recalls her retaliating orders. By that time we may have neither ships nor seamen: and that is precisely the point to which some men wish to reduce us. To see the improvidence of this project (to call it by no harsher name, and without adverting to ulterior views) let us look back to former years.—Notwithstanding the well-founded complaints of some individuals, and the murmurs of others; notwithstanding the frequent executive declarations of maritime aggressions committed by G. Britain; notwithstanding the outrageous decrees of France and Spain, and the wanton spoliations practised and executed by their cruizers and tribunals, of which we sometimes hear a faint whisper;—the com-

merce of the U. States has hitherto prospered beyond all example. Our citizens have accumulated wealth; and the public revenue, annually increasing, has been the president's annual boast.—These facts demonstrate, that although G. Britain, with her thousand ships of war, could have destroyed our commerce, she has really done it no essential injury; and that the other belligerents heretofore restrained by some regard to national law, and limited by the small number of their cruizers, have not inflicted upon it any deep wound. Yet in this full tide of success, our commerce is suddenly arrested: an alarm of war is raised: fearful apprehensions are excited: the merchants, in particular, thrown into a state of consternation, are advised, by a voluntary embargo, to keep their vessels at home. And what is the cause of this mighty but mischievous alarm? We know it in its whole extent. It was the unauthorized attack of a British naval officer on the American frigate *Chesapeake*, to search for and take some deserters known to have been received on board, who had been often demanded, and as often refused to be delivered up. As was expected by all considerate men, and by the president himself (as I have before observed) the British government, on the first information of the unfortunate event (and without waiting for an application) disavowed the act of its officer—disclaimed the principle of searching national armed vessels—and declared its readiness to make suitable reparation, as soon as the state of the case should be fully known.—Under such circumstances, who can justify this alarm of war? An alarm which greatly disquieted the public mind, and occasioned an interruption of commerce extremely injurious to our merchants and sea-faring citizens.—I will close this long letter by stating all the existing pretences (for there are no causes for a war with G. Britain).—1. The British ships of war, agreeably to a right claimed and exercised for ages—a right claimed and exercised during the whole of the administration of Washington, of Adams, and of Jefferson; continue to take some of the British seamen found on board our merchant vessels, and with them a small number of ours, from the impossibility of always distinguishing Englishmen from citizens of the U. States. On this point our government well know that G. Britain is perfectly willing to adopt any arrangement that can be devised, which will secure to her service the seamen who are her own subjects, and at the same time exempt ours from impressment.—2. The merchant vessels of France, Spain, and Holland, be-

ing driven from the ocean, or destroyed, the commerce of those countries with one another, and with their colonies, could no longer be carried on by themselves. Here the vessels of neutral nations came in to their aid, and carried on nearly the whole commerce of those nations. With their seamen thus liberated from the merchant service, those nations, in the present and preceding wars, were enabled to man their ships of war; and their neutral vessels and seamen supplying their places, became in fact, though not in name, auxiliaries in war. The commerce of those nations, without one armed ship on the sea appropriated for its protection, was intended thus to be secured under neutral flags, while the merchant vessels of G. Britain, with its numerous armed ships to guard them, were exposed to occasional captures. Such a course of things G. Britain has resisted, not in the present only, but in former wars; at least as far back as that of 1756. And she has claimed and maintained a right to impose on this commerce some limits and restraints, because it was a commerce which was denied by those nations to neutrals in time of peace; because it was a commerce of immense value to the subjects of her enemies; and because it filled their treasuries with money, to enable them to carry on their wars with G. Britain.—3. The third, and only remaining pretence for war with G. Britain, is the unfortunate affair of the *Chesapeake*; which having been already stated and explained, I will only remark here, that it is not to be believed that the British government, after being defeated, as before mentioned, in its endeavours to make reparation in London for the wrong done by its servant, would have sent hither a special envoy to give honourable satisfaction, but from its sincere desire to close this wound, if our own government would suffer it to be healed.—Permit me now to ask, what man, impartially viewing the subject, will have the boldness to say that there exists any cause for plunging the U. States into a war with G. Britain? Who that respects his reputation as a man of common discernment, will say it? Who that regards the interests and welfare of his country will say it? Who then can justify, who can find an excuse for a course of conduct which has brought our country into its present state of alarm, embarrassment, and distress? For myself, Sir, I must declare the opinion, that no free country was ever before so causelessly, and so blindly, thrown from the height of prosperity, and plunged into a state of dreadful anxiety and suffering. But from this degraded and wretched

situation it is the dispatche be no longer perform the Constitution formation of spect to fo him unfold Let him tell proposals of honourable president ha That they a that they a ruinous to dangerous t we are left nature and furnish a s and style o deem it p correctness ment. A tressing ap forced the timents w I have ex often not Yet I do when I se tive influ of the na affecting zens, wi reasons o deceptive of the en and poste justify th risks of suits aga be more chants th new dan of whic but of knowled elsewhere executi Congre made k citizens safety, against tain th the saf our me consid cy; in procee to mis

situation it is not yet too late to escape. Let the dispatches from our minister in France be no longer concealed. Let the president perform the duty required of him by the Constitution, by giving to Congress full information of the state of the union in respect to foreign nations. Above all, let him unfold our actual situation with France. Let him tell us what are the demands and proposals of her ruler. Had these been honourable to the U. States, would not the president have been eager to disclose them? That they are of an entirely different nature, that they are dishonourable, that they are ruinous to our commercial interests, and dangerous to our liberty and independence, we are left to infer.—I hope, Sir, that the nature and magnitude of the subject will furnish a sufficient apology for the length and style of this letter. Perhaps some may deem it presumptuous thus to question the correctness of the proceedings of our government. A strong sense of duty, and distressing apprehensions of national ruin, have forced the task upon me. To some, the sentiments which, in the sincerity of my heart, I have expressed, may give offence; for often nothing offends so much as truth. Yet I do not desire to offend any man. But when I see the dangerous extent of executive influence; when I see the great council of the nation called on to enact laws deeply affecting the interests of all classes of citizens, without adequate information of the reasons of that call; when I observe the deceptive glosses with which the mischiefs of the embargo are attempted to be palliated, and posterior events adduced as reasons to justify the measure; when I know that the risks of continuing their commercial pursuits against all known dangers can and will be more accurately calculated by our merchants than by our government; when, if any new dangers to commerce were impending, of which our merchants were uninformed, but of which the government obtained the knowledge through its minister at Paris, or elsewhere, it was plainly the duty of the executive to make those dangers known to Congress and the nation; and since if so made known, the merchants and sea-faring citizens would for their own interests and safety, have taken due precautions to guard against them; and as it hence appears certain that an embargo was not necessary to the safety of "our seamen, our vessels, or our merchandize:"—when, Sir, I see and consider these things, and their evil tendency; in a word, when I observe a course of proceeding which to me appears calculated to mislead the public mind to public ruin, I

cannot be silent. Regardless, therefore, of personal consequences, I have undertaken to communicate these details, with the view to dissipate dangerous illusions, to give to my constituents correct information, to excite inquiry, and to rouse that vigilant jealousy which is characteristic of republicans, and essential to the preservation of their rights, their liberties, and their independence.—I have the honour to be, very respectfully, Sir, your obedient servant,
TIMOTHY PICKERING.

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

(Concluded from p. 672.)

LOCAL MILITIA.—*Abstract of Lord Castlereagh's Local Militia Bill.*

The 9th, that persons shall not be exempt by having found substitutes or paid fines in the militia.

The 10th, prescribes the form of oath to be taken.

The 11th, imposes penalty on persons not appearing after being so ballotted; the fine to be proportioned to the amount of the income; the payment of such fine to exempt such person from being ballotted for ——— years.

The 12th, enacts, that a person claiming exemption upon payment of the smaller fine, shall sign a declaration of the amount of his income.

The 13th, on engaging to serve without pay in volunteer corps, part of the fine to be remitted.

The 14th, inflicts a penalty on such persons on being returned non-effective.

The 15th, persons refusing to swear that they have not insured against fine, to forfeit the amount.

The 16th, Quakers not to be enrolled, but to pay certain fines according to the property of such persons.

The 17th, enacts, that where the persons voluntarily enrolling themselves shall amount to the number to be enrolled by ballot under any apportionment in any such parish, then no ballot shall take place in such parish.

The 18th, gives a bounty to persons enrolling themselves voluntarily.

The 19th, enacts, volunteer corps may transfer themselves into local militia.

The 20th, volunteers to swear that they have no other bounty.

The 21st, allowances for necessaries.

The 22d, persons serving to be entitled to such exemptions as the volunteers now have.

The 23d, persons insuring for providing substitutes, or volunteers, subject to penalty.

The 24th, prescribes the mode of officering the corps.

The 25th, relates to the training and exercising for a certain number of days.

The 26th, enacts, that in case of invasion, the corps may be embodied and marched to any part of Great Britain.

The 27th, while training or embodied, to be under the mutiny act and articles of war.

The 28th, entitles to the same privileges and allowances as other militia forces.

The 29th, provides that men may enlist into the army, navy, or marines, except during periods of exercise. Vacancies by enlisting to be supplied.

The 30th, levies fines for men deficient.

The 31st, provides that two-thirds of the fines shall be returned when the men are found.

The remainder of the clauses, nine in number, relate to the assessments for men deficient, the providing for payment of bounties, the collecting of fines, &c.

SWEDEN.—*Proclamation of General Armfeldt, on entering Norway.*

Inhabitants of Norway.—The Danish government has declared war against Sweden, without any cause or provocation on her part; it has crowned the calamities that afflicted the North, and spontaneously submitted to a foreign yoke. The Swedish troops, therefore, enter your country according to the laws of war, in order to prevent hostilities from being committed in their own country. But the laws of war are carried into execution only by soldiers; the peaceful inhabitants of the towns and country, if they excite no disturbances, shall enjoy tranquillity and protection.—The Swedish soldiers, celebrated for order and discipline, respect the personal safety and property of the unarmed; and should Providence bless his majesty's arms, the army under my command, so far from proving hurtful to your different trades, shall open your ports to commerce and importation: quicken your industry; and secure in the North an asylum for loyalty and honour.—AUGUSTUS MAURICE ARMFELDT.

SWEDEN.—*The King of Sweden's Proclamation on the Rupture of the Intercourse with Prussia. Dated Stockholm Castle, April 5th, 1808.*

We, Gustavus Adolphus, by the grace of God, King of Sweden, of the Goths and Vandals, &c. unto all our true and loyal subjects, greeting:—We herewith graciously make known to you, that his majesty, the King of Prussia, has declared to us that all kind of intercourse between his dominions and Sweden is suspended; and that in

consequence thereof all trade and navigation to Swedish ports is prohibited under service penalties; and that further, all Prussian harbours are shut up against all Swedish ships.—This proceeding has not by any means been occasioned on our part; the said government, reduced by French tyranny, affords a fresh proof of the oppression to which all states must submit, that entertain any connection with the French government. An unfortunate lassitude, which prevented Prussia from resisting in due time, has brought her to the distressed situation in which she is now placed—groaning under the domination of France, which still occupies a considerable part of the remains of that monarchy with a numerous army, notwithstanding the conclusion of peace.—We commend you all and severally to the merciful protection of Almighty God.—GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS.

SPAIN.—*From the Madrid Gazette Extraordinary. Order of April 2.—French Army.*

Soldiers—The general business of Sweden has retarded for some days the arrival of the Emperor, but the combined armies of France and Russia are already on their march towards Stockholm, where they will unite, and the Emperor will lose no time in putting himself at the head of his armies in Spain; it is necessary then, that you should put yourselves in a state to appear before his Majesty, and to merit his approbation. General Reboissiere will order cartridges immediately for the infantry to fire with. The Grand Duke hopes to inform his Majesty of the good conduct of his troops, and also hopes to have to praise them in all respects.—Soldiers, I see with pleasure the good order and discipline that is among you, and above all, the harmony that exists between the French and Spanish armies; I am filled with satisfaction. The Spanish nation is deserving of all the best wishes and good will of the French army, as on their part, they do not cease to give us proof of their love and affection. This morning, a soldier who had been condemned to punishment, was about to be delivered over to the hands of justice; but the inhabitants of Madrid have interceded for his pardon, which has been granted; but this must be the last instance. Soldiers, redouble your friendship with the inhabitants, and cement more and more the friendship that ought to unite us.—JOAQUIN, general in chief of the staff. AUG. BELLIARD.—Madrid, April 2, 1808.

SPAIN.—*M. Proclamation the French Duke of notice.*

Soldier the capital mend to yo order, and habitants. allied, and French Arm the good perience i we have to recommen which I an which you find any a Frenchm any excess sequence of any officer glecting h commissio litary com found gui violation, soldier, co the inhabi the rigor shot.—A in the stre days' con serjeant jeants or the beati sonment. and com Madrid— concerns tually ex head o lieutenant guard o cantone

BRAZIL

Portu mand War the l and Braz Man port Plea this let which High

[797]

SPAIN.—*Madrid Gazette Extraordinary.*—*Proclamation for the better Discipline of the French Troops—ordered by the Grand Duke of Berg to be printed for public notice. Dated Madrid, March 27, 1808.*

Soldiers—You are not about to enter the capital of a friendly power; I recommend to you the best discipline, the best order, and the best friendship with its inhabitants. It is a nation to which we are allied, and which ought to find in the French Army a true friend. And recollect the good treatment you have already experienced in the provinces through which we have traversed.—Soldiers—I hope this recommendation will be sufficient, and for which I am guaranteed by the good conduct which you have already observed; but if I find any individual forgetting that he is a Frenchman, he shall be punished; and any excess shall be severely punished in consequence of that which I shall order.—That any officer committing any crime, or neglecting his duty, shall be deprived of his commission and be delivered over to a military commission, for justice.—All soldiers found guilty of robbing, concealing, or of violation, shall be shot.—Any serjeant or soldier, convicted of abusing or ill-treating the inhabitants, shall be delivered over to the rigor of the laws; if of murder to be shot.—Any serjeant or soldier found drunk in the streets, shall be condemned to eight days' confinement in the stocks, and the serjeant be sent into the ranks.—All serjeants or soldiers found in the streets after the beating of the retreat—two days imprisonment.—Generals, chiefs of regiments, and commanders of the French Army in Madrid—each of you will see, as far as it concerns you, that these orders are punctually executed, and that they be read at the head of every company.—JOAQUIN, lieutenant-general commander of the Vanguard of the French army, of the troops cantoned at Madrid.

(Countersigned) EM. GROUCHY.

BRAZIL TRADE.—*Circular Letter from the Portuguese Ambassador to Officers commanding Portuguese or British Vessels of War off Cape Frio, or to the Commanders of the Fortresses of Lage and Santa Cruz and Conditions for the Admission into the Brazils of such Cotton Goods of British Manufacture as were not heretofore imported into Portugal.*

Please to communicate to the bearer of this letter,—captain of the ship—the orders which you may have received from his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, for the admis-

sion and ports of discharge for the ships freighted with the goods specified in this licence.—In the event of no such orders being at Cape Frio, I request the commanders of the fortresses of Lage and St. Cruz to ask for the same royal orders through the secretary of state's office of the proper department, and communicate them to the bearer.

Conditions.—1st.—That all merchants wishing to export cotton goods of British manufacture to the Brazil, without waiting for the regulations of his Royal Highness, whether in Portuguese or British ships, should be obliged to take a licence from the Privy Council to proceed to Cape Frio, and there to wait his Royal Highness's further instructions, as to their port of discharge, to which alone they must give bond to go.—2dly.—That every master and every shipper will give a bond equal to the value of the cargo, at this Custom House, for the due delivery at the Custom-House of the port of discharge ordered by his Royal Highness.—3dly.—That every master and shipper will bind themselves to pay at the Custom-House of such port of discharge, the same duties that were paid in Portugal upon woollen, or in lieu thereof, such as may have been already established by his Royal-Highness the Prince Regent upon cotton goods of British manufacture.—4thly.—According to your offer, and to ascertain that no India goods are exported thither, the manifest of said cargo sworn and authenticated as usual at the Custom-House, will be signed by the agent and consul general, Mr. John Charles Lucena, and by me.—5thly.—On these conditions, which contain all that fair trade can wish for at present, I will most willingly provide every captain with a licence to proceed under the above arrangement, and in case no orders are found at Cape Frio, to proceed as directed on the cover of my licence.—P. S. I need not say, that upon your application, with the licence of the Privy Council, &c. &c. the manifest will be signed by men and my licence delivered immediately, without the least expence to any of the concerned.

SICILY.—*From the London Gazette, April 12.*

The Gazette contains two dispatches from Major-General Sherbrooke, commanding his Majesty's troops in Sicily. The first, dated the 8th Feb. states the surrender of Reggio to the French on the 3d, and that four Sicilian gun-boats had fallen into the enemy's possession; and also confirms the

loss of the *Delight* sloop of war, which in endeavouring to recover the gun boats got on shore on the Calabrian coast, on the 30th Jan. and it being found impossible to get her off she was burnt. On this occasion Capt. Handfield, with several of his ship's company, was killed, and Capt. Seccombe, of the *Glatton*, who was on board the *Delight*, was dangerously wounded, and died on the 3d Feb.—The second dispatch is dated the 23d Feb. and incloses the following report from lieut-Col. Robertson, the commandant of Scylla Castle, stating the evacuation of that place.—General S. adds his highest approbation of the conduct of that officer and the officers and men serving under him in the castle, and of the naval officers and seamen employed to bring away the garrison.

Messina, Feb. 18, 1808.

SIR.—In obedience to your orders, I have the honour to report the particulars of what occurred since the first appearance of the enemy before Scylla.—After being invested by Gen. Regnier's army during seven weeks, and battered for six days by fourteen pieces of heavy ordnance, the little castle of Scylla has fallen into his hands: But I have the heartfelt satisfaction to add, that not one of the gallant garrison placed under my orders has become his prisoner.—In the latter end of Dec. the arrival of troops and ordnance stores at Seminara left me no room to doubt the enemy's intention of besieging Scylla, and parties of the peasantry were accordingly sent out to render the passes of Solano impracticable, and to create obstacles to this advance, by cuts across the various paths which lead from the heights of Milia down to Scylla. This work, as well as the levelling of fences, &c. proceeded rapidly and effectually under the direction of captain Nicholas, Assistant Quarter-Master-General; when upon the 31st of December, the advanced workmen and the out-posts of the masse were driven in by three French battalions and a detachment of cavalry, under gen. Millet, which took post upon the heights above; and on the following day Regnier brought up two more battalions, and spreading his out-posts to Favezzina, Bagnara, &c. completed the investment of the town. At this time the garrison of the castle consisted of two hundred British, and from four to five hundred masse occupied the town.—The enemy's troops were now incessantly employed in forming the roads necessary for bringing his

heavy ordnance from Seminara, while we laboured to render the approach to Scylla difficult, and harrassed the French by constant attacks on his out-posts with parties of the masse, and occasionally with boats. In some of these partial actions the enemy suffered severely; particularly in a night attack at Bagnara, where the voltigeurs of the 23d Light Infantry were cut to pieces.—Owing to these checks, the French were retarded until the 6th of Feb. when they descended the heights in force, and came within a distant range of our guns; and from this day they honoured our little castle with all the detailed precautions of a regular siege, in covering his approaches and communications. The skirmishes between the enemy and the masse became very serious: the latter displayed great gallantry; and enjoying the support of the castle's guns, obliged the French to purchase their advance with heavy loss; but on the 9th, were obliged to yield to the numbers of the enemy, who assailed the town on all sides: our guns, however, covered their retreat; and I had the satisfaction of sending off these brave peasants to Messina without leaving a man in the enemy's hands.—The force which General Regnier had brought to besiege Scylla consisted of a body of cavalry, the 23d light infantry, 1st. 62d. and 101st. of the line, in all about 6,000 men; with five 24 pounders, five eighteens, and four mortars besides field-pieces.—On the morning of the 11th he opened his batteries directing his efforts to the destruction of our upper works, and the disabling of our guns; while under cover of this fire, he laboured to establish two breaching batteries, at 3 and 400 yards distance. It was not, however, till the 14th that our parapet and guns were rendered useless; nor till then did the slaughter abate to which their parties were exposed from our grape and shells.—From this time our defence was confined to musketry, as our guns lay buried under the ruins of the parapet, and the close fire from five 24 pounders became incessant. In the meantime we discovered him attempting to mine the right bastion upon which he continued at work for three nights, but I apprehend without the expected success.—In the night of the 15th, the French pushed round the foot of the rock, with the intention of destroying the Sea staircase, but we happily discovered them, and beat them off with the slaughter to which their desperate situation exposed them.

To be continued.